This is a digitally signed Gazette, to verify click here.
https://rajpatra.hp.gov.in

राजपत्र, हिमाचल प्रदेश

हिमाचल प्रदेश राज्य शासन द्वारा प्रकाशित

बुधवार, 03 जून, 2026 / 13 ज्येष्ठ, 1948

हिमाचल प्रदेश सरकार

LABOUR EMPLOYMENT & OVERSEAS PLACEMENT DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171 002, the 16th May, 2026

No: LEP-E/1/2024.—In exercise of the powers vested under section 17 (1) of the Industrial Disputes Act,1947, the Governor Himachal Pradesh is pleased to order the publication of awards of

the following cases announced by the **Presiding Judge, Labour Court-**cum**-Industrial Tribunal, Shimla, H.P.** on the website of the Printing & Stationery Department, Himachal Pradesh *i.e.* **"e-Gazette":—**

Sl. No.	Ref./ No.	Petitioner	Respondent	Section	Date of Award/Order
1.	Ref.11/2016	Workers Union	M/s Secure Meters Ltd.	10	02-04-2026

By order,
Sd/-
(PRIYANKA BASU INGTY),
Secretary (Lab. Emp. & O.P.).

IN THE COURT OF ANUJA SOOD, PRESIDING JUDGE, HP INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM**-LABOUR COURT, SHIMLA**

Reference No. : 11 of 2016
Instituted on : 04-03-2016
Decided on : 02-04-2026

The President & General Secretary, Secure Meter Workers Union (INTUC) Registration No. 1199, Secure Meter Ltd., Unit- II & III, Barotiwala, District Solan (H.P.) ..*Petitioner*.

Versus

The General Manager, Secure Meter Ltd., Unit- II & III, Barotiwala, District Solan (H.P.) .. *Respondent.*

Reference under Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

For the petitioner : Shri R.K Khidtta, Advocate.

For the respondent : Sh. Rahul Mahajan, Advocate.

AWARD

The following reference was received for adjudication from the appropriate Government:

"**Whether demands raised *vide* demand notice dated 05.01.2015 (copy enclosed) by the President & General Secretary, Secure Meters Workers Union (INTUC) Registration No. 1199, Secure Meter Ltd., Unit II & III, Barotiwala, District Solan, HP raised before and to be fulfilled by the Employer/General Manager M/s Secure Meter Ltd., Unit II & III, Barotiwala, District Solan, HP are legal and justified? If yes, what relief in terms of demand notice dated 05.01.2015 regarding monetary benefits and other service benefits the concerned workers are entitled to from the above employer/Management?"**

2. It is averred in the statement of claim that the President & General Secretary Secure Meter Workers Union (INTUC) Registration No. 1199, Secure Meter Ltd., Unit- II & III, Barotiwala, District Solan, HP (hereinafter to be referred as petitioner union) raised industrial dispute in respect to their demands by serving demand notice dated 05-01-2015 relating to proposed settlement from 01-04-2015 as agreed amicably between the petitioner union and respondent management. The General body of petitioner union in its meeting dated 03-04-2016 passed a resolution that the industrial dispute of 266 workmen be pursued before this Court and has authorized the President and General Secretary to present the case before this Court. For the last approximately 18 years the workers are working with the respondent company and the increase in their salary during this period is nominal in comparison to the price hike. It is further averred that the earlier settlement between the workers and the management of the company was for the period ending on 31-03-2015 and negotiations started between the union and management but of no avail as such demand notice dated 05-01-2015 was served upon the respondent management. The demands as raised vide demand notice dated 05-01-2015 reads as under:—

1. The salary of all workers should be revised. The salary of all workers be increased by ` 9000/- per month. After execution of settlement the amount agreed to under the settlement be paid in lump sum to the workers.

2. Dearness Allowance to the employees should be linked with the Consumer Price Index fixed by the Government. Dearness Allowance to all employees should be paid quarterly every year.

3. Yearly Bonus of Rs. 20,000/- should be paid by the Company to all employees.
4. The Company should contribute 95% towards canteen Services and the workers should be fixed to 5%.

5. Production related annual allowance be paid to all employees.

6. Loan Facility to all employees be provided depending upon their length of service with a minimum of Rs. 50,000/- and maximum of Rs. 5.00 Lakhs.

7. 75% of the amount determined/agreed to be increase in the salary of all employees should be added to their Basic Pay.

8. All employees should be granted PL in place of EL and CL.

9. The designation of all employees should be converted/changed from 'Operator' to 'Associate' and after re-determining their work norms, they should be given promotion depending upon their qualification and experience.

10. All employees should be entitled to be given LTA facility

11. All employees should be paid Night Shift allowance depending upon their duty.

12. In case of sudden death or accident of any employee, the Company should pay an amount of Rs. 5.00 Lakh to his family and Insurance Policy of Rs. 10.00 Lakh should be drawn/made for the employees of the Company by the Company.

13. In case of emergency, all employees should be provided with Company vehicle at their residence as well as in Company or in case of necessity, this facility should be provided for their native place of residence.

14. Workers should be issued two sets of uniform and two pair of shoes according to seasons,

15. The time of 'A', 'B' and 'C' shifts should be fixed as eight hours.

16. The problems of all employees relating to ESI should be solved by the HR Department at its level.

17. All employees had to suffer problems several times due to weak communication system of the Company. Therefore, all employees should be permitted to bring their mobile phones along with them.

18. In case workers are retained for additional time by the Company then the workers should be paid three times of the monthly salary fixed by the Company for the additional time for which he has been retained and in case workers are retained on holiday then four times of salary should be paid for such period.

19. All employees should be provided with Bus facility to Nalagarh and Pinjore.

20. All employees should be paid allowance on the basis of their monthly attendance. An employee with 100% attendance should be paid a minimum of Rs. 500/- as allowance in addition to his salary.

21. All bye-laws/Rules of the Company should be implemented equally and impartially on all employees without bias.

22. Every month four gate-passes be issued on personal request/necessity and two gate-passes be issued from Company to every employee.

23. No employee should be put to work from one unit to other and work from no employees should be taken from one unit to other without proper transfer and in case the employee is deputed from one Department to other Department, then the work norms should be given to such employee in writing.

24. Annual working days of all employees should be fixed as 240 days which should include his own leaves, Govt. holidays and he should be entitled to ESI Medical facility for this period.

25. The Executive Committee Members of the Union should be provided/entitled to official leave and official gate-pass for any matter concerning the Union.

26. Provision should be made for holiday to the worker on the eve of International Workers' Day every year.

27. If company put the worker to work for additional two hours, then worker should be provided with refreshment for minimum of Rs.15/- and in case additional work for four hours is taken, the worker should be provided with meals by the Company at expenses of the Company.

28. The Workers and the Management, both are in favour of maintaining discipline. In case Company institute takes any disciplinary action or any other proceedings

are instituted against any employee then the Members of the Executive Committee should also be associated with the same.

29. Workers should be paid higher charges for Hotel and DA in case of tour relating to the work of the Company.

30. All workers are in favour of healthy atmosphere in the Company. Separate Smoking Zone should be created/fixed in the Company for employees who have the habit of smoking in order to keep the atmosphere healthy.
31. In order to save the employees from facing any accident ATM facility should be provided in the Company premises.

32. RMS or M.B.B.S. Doctor should be made available in the Company to provide First Aid in the Company premises.

33. This settlement is applicable from April, 2015. In this no term of settlement from the previous settlement from workers' side shall be recognized/applicable.

34. Every employee should be extended the facility of Leave Travel Concession at Company expenses twice a year.

35. In order to improve the working of the Workers in the Company, proper working atmosphere be provided to the workers.

All the demands of the workers are genuine and legal as the workers are putting their best in the working of the company. The increase in the prices and responsibilities of the workers is also demanding the corresponding increase in their salary. The Dearness Allowance needs to be based on Consumer Price Index fixed by the Government and insurance cover of Rs. 10.00 lakhs at the company expenses in case of accidental death/sudden death of the workers and grant of Rs. 5 lakhs to be paid to the family of the worker is genuine. The workers of petitioner union be permitted to bring their mobile phones at work place and the incentive to the workers for 100% attendance, productivity linked bonus of Rs. 20,000/- and LTC are such facilities which encourage the workers to put extra efforts for the benefits and profits of the company. Earlier there was a separate designation for skilled as well as un-skilled workers which has been changed by the company as such the designation of the workers depending upon their nature of work deserves to be maintained. Based on qualification and experience and promotion which has not been given to the workers for very long time deserves to be granted. The time of three shifts has not been properly fixed and the workers are facing problem as such the workers deserves to be paid night shift allowance. The matter relating to ESI medical facility of the workers deserves to be taken up and got solved by the HR department and prayed through this claim that and award granting the relief to the workers be passed. Along-with the claim copy of membership detail of secure meter workers union of bated, resolution dated 03-04-2016 and demand notice dated 05.01.2015 have also been filed.

3. Notice of this claim was sent to the respondent, in pursuance thereof, respondent contested the claim by filing reply wherein the respondent took preliminary objections that the reference is bad in law, conciliation proceedings initiated by the union in respect of employees of two different establishments of the company having different address/location, separate factory license, different products and different set of employees is not legally tenable, the signatories of the statement of claim are neither authorized nor legally competent to sign and file the claim on behalf of workmen of both the establishments of company, the petitioner union and signatories of claim have not come with clean hands before this Court, the petitioner union has not complied with their legal obligation as desired under Sections 15, 25 and 28 of the Trade Union Act, 1926. It is

averred that the company is engaged in the business of manufacturing of electrical energy meters and started manufacturing of products in Himachal Pradesh in the year 1996. Initially the respondent company had two units and later unit III and IV was established, but due to lack of competitiveness the unit I and IV became unviable and had been closed. The company is leader in its business and is known for its best working conditions and quality products. Company has always extended salary/wages and other benefits to its employees better than other industries of the region which are engaged in the same and similar business, but due to go slow and intentional hurdles by the less output, the management is facing problems and to meet customers commitment management is deploying additional manpower. It was further asserted that the company is fair and to vouch interest of the employees, it has kept transparent policy. Even, for appraisal the company has four tier appraisal process and the employee has right to fill his appraisal/self-assessment form upon which his reporting officer/manager gives his remark and the same is put before the departmental head and in case of any query or specific need it is further looked by the unit head and hereafter by MD, but some of the employees have refused to fill their self-assessment form and have violated company's policy. On merits, it is admitted that the union had served demand notice dated 05-01-2015 to the management for proposed settlement to be entered between the workers and the management, however, the unreasonable demands have been raised by the union. The aim of the union was not to enter into the settlement with the management but to create irreparable gap between the management and its workers and also to harm the industrial peace and harmony of the establishment. It is reiterated that there is no authorization by the workers to the President and General Secretary of the union for presenting the case before this Court and to do all the acts necessary under law. It is submitted that the workers of the company are already getting more salary in comparison to the workers of the similar industries situated in the region. The management tried its level best to explain and convince the union before the conciliation officer to resolve the matter amicably but in vain. All the demands as raised by the petitioner union vide demand notice dated 05-01-2015 are replied by the respondent management as under:—

(i) The demand of revision of the salary of the workers by increasing the salary by now Rs. 9000/- per month is baseless and cannot be accepted. Neither there is any basis nor is any reasoning for increasing the salary by Rs. 9000/- per month. The management is not in a position to bear the financial burden by increasing the salary of the workers, as demanded. Even otherwise, the demand must be viewed in light of the average wages being paid currently to the workers for their respective categories. The management has already made and is still making payment of total salary to the workers which are more than the minimum wages as notified by the appropriate government from time to time for their respective categories.

(ii) That the demand of dearness allowance to the workers linked with the Consumer Price Index as fixed by the government is imaginary not tenable at all. The management is already paying salary to the workers, which is much more than the minimum wages as notified by the State Government from time to time. The dearness allowance is part of the minimum wages which is revised by the Government after considering all the factors including cost of living. No management is under obligation to pay over and above the minimum wages notified by the government. Further to this as per settled law, the employers who are paying more than the minimum wages to its employees do not require to make payment of additional dearness allowance as demanded in para under reply.

(iii) That the demand of payment of yearly bonus of Rs. 20000/- to all the workers is also baseless and has no justification. It is submitted that the company has already been making payment of bonus @ 20%, which is maximum bonus to be paid by

an employer to its worker as per the provisions of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965.

(iv) The demand of 95% contribution towards canteen services by the company and 5% by the workers is also without any basis and cannot be accepted. The management is already providing the quality canteen services at the affordable cost to the workers and bearing the financial burden of the same.

(v) The demand of production related annual allowance for the workers has again no basis. There is no law for providing such production related annual allowance to the workers, even otherwise the company has already been providing all the benefits/allowances to the workers as per its financial capacity.

(vi) The demand of loan facility to the workers to the tune of Rs. 50,000/- (Fifty Thousand) to 5,00,000/- (Five Lacs) as per their length of service has again no basis, even otherwise the company is not a Bank and it cannot provide the loan as per the requirement of its employees. Thus, the demand is not acceptable at all.

(vii) That the demand of 75% of the increased amount to be merged/added in the basic pay is again baseless, unreasonable, untenable and cannot be agreed upon.

(viii) The demand of grant of PL in the place of EL and CL has again no basis. The company is providing leaves to its workers as per provisions of the Factories Act, 1948 and as per Himachal Pradesh, Factory Rules and other applicable laws. Even otherwise the company has no right to change or alter the statutory provisions of law such as converting CL & EL into PL. Thus, the demand, made in para under reply, is also baseless and cannot be accepted.

(ix) Again the demand of changing the designations of the workers has no basis. The designations of the workers are as per their category and the nature of duties being performed by them. Thus, the designation cannot be changed or addressed as per whims and fancies of the claimants or the purported union. The promotions of the employees are done as per the procedure of the company. For the promotions the qualification, aptitude, skill level, experience of the concerned employee are important parts which is taken care of during the appraisal every year and by not participating in the appraisal process, the workers are denying the company any objective basis for assessment of promotions. Thus, the present demand has no ground and cannot be imposed upon the management.

(x) Regarding the demand of the LTA facility to the workers, it is submitted that providing the LTA facility is not statutory obligation and the management is not in a financial position to extend the LTA facility to the workers and thus the demand of the LTA facility is without any basis and cannot be accepted.

(xi) The demand of night shift allowance has no basis. It is submitted that the night shift in the factory, if carried out with permission, is legal. Though the management has permission for running the factory in three shifts but our factory is running in two shifts only. However, in case as per business exigencies, the management has to run the factory in all the three shifts, it has right to run the night shift without making additional payment. The workmen shall bear in mind that it is obligatory upon them to abide by the reasonable order of the management in that regard. Therefore, the demand of the night shift allowances is again baseless and cannot be accepted.

(xii) Regarding the demand raised in sub para 12 of the para 5 regarding payment of Rs. 5,00,000/- to the family of the worker in his sudden or accidental death and also demand of insurance policy for the sum of Rs. 10,00,000/- for the workers by the company have again no basis and cannot be accepted.

(xiii) That the demand of company vehicle to the residence of the employees in case of an emergency is again baseless and has been made knowing very well that there is no legal obligation upon the management to provide such facility at their residence or in the company. However, the management is already taking care of safety and security of its employees and doing the needful. Apart from that the employees are already availing vehicle facility for going to ESI Hospital when they are on duty accompanied by a co-workman and at some occasions it has also been observed that some employees deliberately go out by pretending to be sick whereas they appear to be perfectly well. We again reiterate that though it is not obligatory upon the management but it is bearing additional cost on this account just to maintain industrial harmony.

(xiv) The demand of issue of two sets of uniforms and two pairs of shoes according to the seasons are again baseless. The factory runs in a pollution free atmosphere and it provides Apron to the workers while at work. Thus, there is no need of providing two sets of uniforms and socks to the workers, as demanded.

(xv) The demand of fixing the time of A, B & C shifts for 8 hours are again baseless. The aforesaid shifts are already fixed for 8 hours and they are not performing duty for 8 hours only.

(xvi) The demand of the solving the ESI related problems of the workers by the HR is imaginary and baseless. The HR department is already extending help to the employees, in case they have any problem and can be solved at their end. However, in case the employees have any issue with ESI Corporation and their system, it cannot be solved by the HR department as it has no control over external agency.

(xvii) The demand of carrying mobile phones by all the workers during their shift is not acceptable at all. As far as the urgent communication, if required by any worker with his family is concerned, there are fixed land line phones in the department which is already being used by all the employee when needed. Apart from that the purported secretary and president of the union are permitted to carry their mobile phones with them inside the factory of the company and they can easily extend the concerned worker in case of emergency. Thus, the demand is not acceptable at all.

(xviii) That the demand of payment at the triple rate, if a worker is retained for additional time and for calling on any holiday he must be paid four times of his actual salary for the day, is concerned, the same is baseless and not legally tenable. The factory of the company is being run as per the provisions of the Factories Act, 1948 and rules there made under and employees are paid as per the provisions of the Factories Act.

(xix) The demand of providing bus facility to the workers for Nalagarh and Pinjore is also not tenable. First of all neither there is any worker coming from the Nalagarh or from Pinjore nor there is any legal obligation to provide transport facility at

their door step. The workers of the company are residing at nearby places and thus the demand of bus facility from Pinjore and Nalagarh has no ground.

(xx) The demand of payment of allowance as per their monthly attendance and also demand of minimum of Rs. 500/- as allowance in addition to the salary to the worker having 100% attendance cannot be accepted being without any basis. It is duty of every worker/worker to attend his duty regularly and he cannot be irregular in his attendance. Thus, if any worker is present on all the working days in a month, he is just performing his required duty. Thus, the said demand is not tenable at all.

(xxi) Regarding the demand of implementation of by-laws/rules of the company on all the workers without any biasness equally and impartially, it is submitted that this demand has no basis as the company is already implementing all the by-laws/rules of the company equally and impartially on the all workers of the company:

(xxii) The demand of issuing four gate passes on personal request/necessity in every month and two gate passes from company to every worker is vague and without any basis. The gate passes are issued to the workers due to emergency situations and the same cannot be claimed as right and cannot be accepted.

(xxiii) That regarding demand of not taking work from any worker from one unit to other without proper transfer and in case the employee is deputed from one department to other department then the work norms should be given to the such employees in writing, it is submitted that making such demands amount to defiance of service condition by the claimants. As per business exigencies, the management has right to get the work done from its employees by deputation or transfer who are doing that work and have complete knowledge of the desired work. The management is not obtaining any work which is beyond their service conditions.

(xxiv) The demand of fixing working days for all the workers as 240 days including his own leaves and government holidays etc. are again baseless and cannot be accepted. It is reiterated that the factory of the company is being run as per the provisions of the Factories Act, 1948 and rules made there under and the management is providing leaves and other benefits to the workers as per the provisions of the said act and other applicable Acts and Rules made there under. The workers of the company are getting all types of leaves for which they are entitled to and as such their demand for fixing working days of 240 days in a year including all the leaves and holidays is illogical without any basis and hence cannot be accepted.

(xxv) The demand for providing official leave and official gate pass for any matter concerning the union to the executive committee members of the union is not acceptable being without any basis. The purported office bearers of the union are primarily are the workers of the company and are employed for performing their respective duties and they cannot ask for any official leave or official gate pass for carrying out union activities during duty hours disrupting normal working. The company has no objection for any of its worker to become a member of any union or becoming office bearer of any union but it cannot facilitate any worker for performing their union activities which hampers the normal work of the company. Thus, the demand made in para under reply has no basis and cannot be accepted.

(xxvi) The company is providing the leaves and holidays as per Factories Act, 1948 and rules made there under and as per other applicable enactments. If the union wants the management to declare holiday on the eve of the International Workers Day every year the same can be considered by the management as per law and practice. It can replace weekly off with the International Workers Day or it can replace with any declared holiday with consultation of the workers. However, it is not possible for the management to declare any additional holiday on any account.

(xxvii) As far as the demands of providing refreshment for minimum of Rs. 15 in case worker is asked to work for additional two hours and also for providing meals by the company on its expenses to the worker who is asked for additional work of four hours, are concerned the same cannot be accepted being without any basis. The workers, who are asked to perform over time duties, are paid at the rate as has been prescribed by the law. It has not been provided anywhere in the law that the persons performing O.T. will also be provided free tea and meals by the management, as has been demanded. However if any employee is present on duty at the time of lunch or dinner or tea time they are already availing the same.

(xxviii) The demand of representation through member of the executive committee in case any disciplinary proceedings is initiated against any worker is concerned, the same is vague and has been raised for the sake adding one demand. The delinquent employee has right to be represented through any of his co- employee of his own choice during enquiry (Disciplinary proceedings). However, he should not be terminated employee or ceased employee or suspended or charge sheeted for the same charge.

(xxix) The demand of higher charges for hotel and D.A. in case of tour relating to the work of the company is again not tenable at all. The demand for higher hotel charge and D.A. has no basis and the same is vague and cannot be accepted.

(xxx) The demand for creating smoking zones for the workers who are habitual smoking is concerned the same cannot be accepted by the company. Smoking not only injurious for the smoker but also injurious for non-smokers and is not acceptable at all.

(xxxi) As far as demand for providing ATM facility in the company premises is concerned the said facility is not in the control of the management. The ATM's are installed by the Banks as per its norms. The management has no problem if the ATM is installed in its premises if any bank agrees for the same.

(xxxii) The demand of making available RMS or MBBS doctor in the factory premises for proving First-Aid is without any basis. The best possible First-Aid is available in the factory premises and the company also facilitates to the injured or sick workers by providing them the transport facility to the ESI hospital/dispensary apart from calling doctor time to time. The management bears huge cost for providing transport to workers for going to the ESI hospital/dispensary.

(xxxiii) The workers refused to receive the benefits of the earlier settlement after expiry of the same and hence they voluntarily terminated the earlier settlement.

(xxxiv) The demand of LTC at company expenses twice in a year is baseless and hence not legally tenable.

(xxxv) The demand of providing proper working atmosphere for the workers by the company is again vague and baseless. The company is providing best possible and proper working atmosphere for the workers. It is unfortunate that some workers of the company are using deliberate tactics to slow down the production of the company and also to create unrest in the establishment to pressurize the management for accepting the unreasonable and unfair demands of the purported union. The purported union has been instrumental for the aforesaid acts of the workers of the company.

It is denied that the demands of the workers are genuine and legal, however, it is reiterated that the same are without any basis and unreasonable and also having no legal force. The company has been deteriorating year by year due to great competition in the market and increasing production and transportation cost. The company has to import the component which is used in its products and it has to pay for those in dollars and due to volatile rupee condition the cost of the production has been substantially increased and the same is also beyond the control of the management. The demand for increase in salary and other benefits must be fair and reasonable and also in accordance with the financial condition of the establishment and prayed for the dismissal of the claim petition.

4. By filing rejoinder, the petitioner union denied the preliminary objections as well as averments as made on merits in the reply and reiterated the averments as made in the claim petition.

5. On the pleadings, this Court formulated the following issues on 08-11-2017.

1. Whether the demands raised by the workers union vide demand notice dated 05-01-2015 to be fulfilled by the respondent are legal and justified, as alleged?
..*OPP.*

2. If issue no. 1 is proved in affirmative, to what relief of monetary benefits and other service benefits the concerned workers are entitled to?
..*OPP.*

3. Whether the reference is bad and non-maintainable, as alleged?
..*OPR.*

4. Relief.

6. Thereafter, the parties to the lis were directed to adduce evidence in support of the issues so framed.

7. I have heard the Learned Counsel for the parties and have also perused the records of the case carefully.

8. For the reasons to be recorded hereinafter while discussing the issues for determination, my findings thereon are as under:

Issue No. 1: Partly yes.
Issue No. 2: As per award.
Issue No. 3: No

Relief : Reference is answered partly in favour of workers union as per operative part of the award.

REASONS FOR FINDINGS

ISSUES NO. 1 & 2.

9. Being interlinked and correlated both these issues are taken up together for discussion and decision.

10. The onus to prove issues no. 1 & 2 is on the petitioner union.

11. To prove the averments as raised in the claim petition, the petitioner union examined Sh. Sanjeev Kumar, as PW-1, who deposed that he is President of the workers union of respondent company and is working as Operator -IV with the company. He tendered in evidence his affidavit Ex. PW-1/A, which is just a reproduction of the averments as made in the claim petition. He also tendered in evidence copy of resolution Ex. PW-1/B, copy of list of workers Ex. PW-1/C, copy of demand notice Ex. PW-1/D and the salary slip of workers named as Balwan Singh Ex. PW-1/E to Ex. PW-1/H.

12. During cross-examination, he admitted that he has not placed on record the constitution of their union. He stated that the case was filed on the basis of resolution Ex. PW-1/B passed in general body meeting. He admitted that there is only one resolution with respect to the present case on the basis of which the present matter was initiated. He denied that there is no union in the name of Secure Meter Workers union (INTC) and no union with this name was registered. He denied that Secure Meter Workers Union (INTUC) is not competent and has no locus standi to initiate the present matter. He further denied that the demand notice Ex. PW-1/D is not legally maintainable. Self-stated that the union had entered into a settlement with the management w.e.f. March, 2012 to March, 2015. He denied that the settlement was not with the union and the same was entered in between the management and the workmen before the conciliation officer. He deposed that their demand is that all the workmen upto the level of operators should be given privileged leave instead of earned and casual leave. He denied that the management is giving all the statutory benefits to all the workmen. He further denied that the respondent is providing all the statutory benefits higher than the same and similarly situated factories in the region. He deposed that he is skilled worker and is drawing gross wages of Rs. 15986/- per month. He denied that his wages are almost double the minimum wages notified by the government. He denied that there is a downfall in the total business due to various reasons. He admitted that there is a canteen in the factory. He further admitted that on the death of the workman a sum of Rs. 2,00,000/- is granted to his legal heirs. Self-stated that this amount is given by deducting the amount from the salaries of the employees. He denied that the management provides the vehicle with attendant to the ailing workman. He denied that the demands mentioned in demand notice Ex. PW-1/D are baseless and unreasonable. He admitted that the union has not filed any case of unfair labour practice. He denied that the respondent company is not in a position to bear any additional financial burden nor there is any legal obligation upon the company to provide the additional benefits as claimed in demand notice Ex. PW-1/D. He also denied that the resolution Ex. PW-1/B has not been passed for raising the demand notice Ex. Ex. PW-1/D.

13. Petitioner also examined, Sh. Bittu Kumar, who appeared into the witness box as PW-2 and tendered in evidence his affidavit Ex. PW-2/A wherein he deposed that he is working as Operator-3 in respondent company and he is member of the workers union. He also reiterated almost all the averments as made in the claim petition.

14. During cross-examination, he admitted that neither he remained President nor Secretary of the workers union in the year 2016 when this case was filed. He admitted that he had not placed any document on record showing that he was authorized by the workers to depose in this case. Self-stated that he is one of the effected workers in the present case. He admitted that vide Ex.

PW-1/B only President and Secretary of the union were authorized to follow up the matter with the Advocate. He admitted that during conciliation, he never attended the conciliation proceedings before the conciliation officer, Baddi. He admitted that he is getting social security benefits from the respondent company. He further admitted that his salary component also includes allowances and as on date he is getting Rs. 13965/- per month as salary which is much more than minimum wages. Self-stated that his salary is much less as he has put 16 years of service and his designations have also been changed. He admitted that the government notify minimum wages for all categories. He deposed that as per his knowledge for semi-skilled workers, the minimum wages are Rs. 7004/- and for skilled workers it is Rs. 8075/- per month. He further deposed that the union never consulted him before raising general demands as to what demands are to be raised. The demands were decided by the office bearers of the union. He admitted that due to lack of business, one unit of the respondent company at Damwala is without work and workers are sitting idle and they are being paid salary. He denied that the company is extending all statutory benefits to which workers are entitled to and unable to bear further financial burden. He also denied that the general demands are not genuine and cannot be accepted.

15. Sh. Sanjay Suman Shrivastava, appeared into the witness box as PW-3 to deposed that as per record the average salaries of the workers in the year 2015 was 7030/- which was the minimum pay and was extended upto about Rs. 13000/- per month. As on today, the wage pay of the workers is between Rs 8400 to Rs. 17.000. He further deposed that as on May, 2015 the gross salary of Suresh Kumar was Rs. 10,159 and now his salary is Rs. 10,722. He admitted that they are giving an increase to all their workers every year. Self-stated that the people who are not part of this charter of demand and are strictly following the appraisal process are being given the increase in wages. He admitted that no increase has been granted to 167 workers. He admitted that 167 workers are also entitled for revision of pay and further admitted that 167 workers are undertaking similar nature of work but self-stated that though their grades are different. He showed ignorance whether any action has been taken against 167 workers for poor performance or any disciplinary action has been initiated against them in this behalf. He deposed that as per statement for the year 2019, unit 3 at Damuwala earned profits amounting to Rs. 40000000/- and as per Ex. PX-1, the loss and profit statement of the unit-2 situated at Baddi, the profits of the year 2019 has been recorded as Rs. 410000000.

16. During cross-examination, he deposed that there are two other companies working in the vicinity i.e. HPL and Landis Plus Gear but Landis Plus Gear has now been closed. He admitted that Secure Meter has been paying better remuneration then other industries similarly situated in the region. He deposed that the respondent had made an offer for settlement but the workers had declined the offer made by the company.

17. Sh. Himanshu Chitkara, appeared into the witness box as PW-4 to depose that he is working as Employer relation Manager with Mondelezs India Pvt. Ltd., and the company has a unit in Village Sandholi, Baddi, Solan, H.P. which has 675 workers consisting of technicians, boiler operators and workers for packing. In the year 2015 the average pay packet of the workers ranged between Rs. 24000/- to 34000/- and as on date the aforesaid range is between Rs. 38000/- to Rs. 50000/-. The company has entered into a long-term settlement with the workers union which is for three years. As per long term settlement they have given the increase of Rs. 5000/- in three years.

18. During cross-examination this witness has stated that Mondlez India Pvt. Ltd., is a Multi-National Company and they have four factories across India. The company has taken over the establishment of Cadbury India Pvt. Ltd., which was more than seventy years old. which was seventy years old and the annual turnover of the company is around Rs. Six thousand crores. He admitted that the company's pay remuneration to its workers based on its profits. He admitted that Mondlez India Pvt. Ltd., is a food processing unit. He further admitted that the wages of the employees and categorization is different in different companies.

19. This is the entire evidence led by the petitioner.

20. To rebut the evidence of the petitioner, respondent examined Shri Jai Chand Thakur, Manager, who appeared into the witness box as RW-1 and tendered in evidence his affidavit Ex. RW-1/A, which is just a reproduction of the averments as made in the reply. He also tendered in evidence copies of intimation dated 22-05-2014, 24-05-2014, 27-05-2014, 28-12-2019, 30-01-2020, 29-01-2021 and 07-01-2022 to the workers EX. RW-1/B to Ex. RW-1/H, copy of reply/ refusal by the Secure Meter Worker Union dated 06-01-2020 Ex. RW-1/J, copy of performance management Ex. RW-1/K and proposal for settlement dated 07-06.-2022 Ex. RW-1/L.

21. During cross-examination, he denied that he was drawing salary of more than Rs. 1,50,000/- per month. He admitted that petitioner union is recognized by the respondent management. He stated that one long-term settlement was entered between the petitioner union and respondent management which was valid from 2012-2015. He admitted that settlement as Ex. PX. He further admitted that the petitioner union thereafter had submitted charter of demand Ex PW-1/D to the respondent management and no settlement was arrived between the parties on the basis of Ex. PW-1/D. Self stated that this demand charter/ notice was submitted during the time period of earlier settlement of Ex. PX as such this demand notice was not legally valid. He admitted that the demands raised through Ex PW-1/D were raised for the period after expiry of Ex. PW-1/D. He denied that demand notice Ex PW-1/D had no effect on earlier settlement Ex PX, but self-stated that the petitioner union had agreed during settlement Ex PX that they would not raise any demand notice till 31st March 2015 as such the demand notice Ex. PW-1/D was in violation of the earlier settlement. He admitted that it is not mentioned in Ex. PW-1/D that any demand of the petitioner union was to be implemented between the period w.e.f. 01-04-2012 to 31-03-2015. He further admitted that long-term settlement is due between petitioner union and respondent management. He denied that all the service benefits are granted/ settled with the workers only through long-term settlement. He further denied that no service benefits have been granted to the workers by the respondent management since, April 2015. He denied that no increase in pay scale or perks has been allowed to the workmen since April, 2015. Self-stated that respondent management has complied with the provisions of Minimum Wages Act. He denied that benefits of earlier settlement were stopped after April, 2015. He also denied that this Court had passed order to extend benefits of earlier settlement EX. PX to the workers till the new settlement is arrived between the parties. Self-stated that the order of the Court has been complied with by the respondent management. He denied that the entire benefits of Ex. PX have not been extended to the workmen despite the Court orders. He admitted that recovery petition has been filed before this Court by the petitioner union for recovery of dues/benefits under settlement Ex PX after the Court orders. He denied that all the workers working with the respondent management are highly skilled workers and they work on the machines and only skilled workers can work on the machines. He further denied that all the workers who work on machines, falls under the skilled category. Self-stated that there are different categories of workers who work in different categories and with different qualifications and skills. He admitted that some of the workers of the workers union are working with the respondent management prior to his joining the respondent company. He denied that most of the workers of the petitioner union are working with the respondent management for more than 20 to 25 years. He categorically denied that the members of the petitioner union have not been promoted to higher grades. Self-stated that the workers who had filled the appraisal forms and had completed the milestones as mentioned in the appraisal form were promoted. He denied that in Ex. PX there was no mentioned or requirement for the workers to fill the appraisal forms. Self-stated that this requirement is mentioned in clause 4 क, ख, ग of Ex. PX. He denied that the word appraisal has not been mentioned in any part of the clause-4. Self-stated that it makes mention of overall performance of the workers and the workers of the union had filled the appraisal forms for one year and thereafter they stopped filling the forms. He admitted that the appraisal form is filled by the worker and the performance is assets by the management. Self-stated that it is done in mutual

consultation of the supervisor and the workers. He admitted that all the monitory benefits of Ex PX have been paid to the workers till 31st March 2015. He denied that none of the workers of the union have filled the appraisal forms for the years 2012 to 2015. He admitted that the workers who were not the members of the petitioner union were granted promotion and other benefits after March 2015. Self-stated that the workers who followed the policies of the respondent management were granted these benefits. He denied that respondent is a profit earning unit. He denied that the demand raised by the petitioners regarding pay hike of Rs 9,000/- per month as raised in Ex. PW-1/D is genuine. He further denied that all the demands raised through Ex. PW-1/D are genuine demands of the petitioner union. He also denied that the hike in the salary was due in the year 2015. He admitted that respondent company had given offer before the Labour-cum-conciliation officer in the year 2019 to increase the salary of the workers. He further denied that respondent management had agreed to give 70% hike in salary to the workers and Rs. 1,50,000/- as arrear to each of the worker. Self-stated that this proposal was made on the salary which was being paid to the workers under the terms of settlement Ex. PX. He expressed ignorance that increase of Rs. 2,450 per month for the year 2016, Rs. 37,000/- per year for 2018 was given to Ashok Kumar Operator and Rs. 2450 per month of the year 2016, Rs. 37,000/- per year for 2018 was given to Shri Sanjay Kumar, whereas increase of Rs 2,450 per month for the year 2016, Rs. 37,000/- per year for 2018 was given to Surjeet and Rs 3,833/- per month for the year 2015. Rs 60.000/- per year for 2016 was given to Jyoti Ram. He admitted that document Ex P-1 (3 leaves). Ex P-2 (3 leaves). Ex. P-3 (3) leaves). Ex P-4 (2 leaves) have been issued by the authorized officer of the respondent company. He denied that salary of Rs 9,000/- per month was allowed to some other workers as such the respondent management is also under legal obligation to raise the salary of the members of the petitioner union to Rs. 9,000/-per month. He further denied that the workers working with other factories in Barotiwala and Baddi for 20-25 years are getting salaries of Rs. 40,000/- to Rs. 45,000/- . He denied that the bonus is deducted from the salary of the workers. He admitted that increment letters Ex. P-5, Ex. P-6, Ex. P-7 & Ex. P-8 are of one of the petitioners namely Satish Kumar, in which bonus is shown to be part of the salary of the petitioner. He admitted that the bonus is not paid to the petitioner per month as shown in the EX. P-5 to P-7. Self-stated that the bonus is paid annually and the basic salary as shown in Ex. P-5 to P-7 is shown separately as the EPF and ESI contribution are deducted from the basic salary. He denied that in similar situated company in Barotiwala/ Baddi, canteen charges are being paid in the ratio of 95% by company and 5% by worker. He admitted that the workmen are entitled for yearly increment. Self-stated that they have to abide by the policy of the respondent company. He admitted that yearly increment has not been paid to the members of the petitioner union since April 2015 till date. Self-stated that as per the Court order the interim relief to the workmen on the basis of Ex. PX has been disbursed. He denied that the demand of the workers for loan Rs. 5,00,000/- is genuine. He denied that prior to this the respondent management had advanced loans to the workers ranging from Rs. 50,000/- to Rs. 5,00,000/-. He admitted that the PL is allowed to the officers as per their entitlement and the same is not allowed to the workers. He further admitted that CL and EL are allowed only for 4 chances. He denied that respondent company is legally bound to pay salary of skilled workers to the members of petitioner union. He admitted that Ex P/10 has been issued by the officer of their company. He denied that Junior Technician is a skilled worker, whereas Operator 2 is shown as Semi-skilled. Self-stated the workers are termed as skilled or semi-skilled on the basis of notifications issued by the Government. He denied that the workers are entitled for night allowance. He admitted that earlier transport allowance was also allowed to the workers, which now is not paid. Self-stated that it has merged in the other heads of allowances. He admitted that two pairs of shoes and dress are not provided to the workers. Self-stated that there is no provision for the same in the factory Act. He denied that the respondent was paying 8 hours salary to the workers but were taking work for about more than 8 hours. He further denied that respondent is not paying wages whenever the extra work is taken from the workers. He admitted that facilities of bus is not provided to the workers whereas officers are being provided such facilities. Self stated they are paying for the same. He admitted that attendance allowance was paid to the workers till 2011 and

thereafter the same was discontinued. Self stated that the same has merged with the other allowances. He denied that gate passes are not supplied as and when demanded by the workers. He further denied that workers are not allowed to complete 240 days just to avoid giving benefits to them. He admitted that no smoking zone has been identified in the factory premises. Self-stated that respondent is manufacturing electronic meters as such smoking is prohibited inside the factory premises. He denied that no first-aid facility is provided to the workers in the factory premises. He admitted that no medical officer is posted/ engaged in the factory premises. He further admitted that Ex. PX was applicable to both the units which was raised for both the units. He denied that workers have complied with all the obligations under trade union Act. He denied that variable benefits are not paid to the workers. He denied that the respondent management has intentionally not entered into fresh agreement with the petitioner union just to avoid giving benefits to the petitioners which are legally admissible to them, such as salary and other benefits.

22. Respondent also examined, Sh. Mohammed Raffi, Deputy General Manager, who appeared into the witness box as RW-2 and tendered in evidence his affidavit Ex. RW-2/A, wherein he has deposed that he initially joined the respondent company in October, 1996 as Executive Production at unit-I, Darotiwala, District Solan, HP and all the plants/units including Barotiwala based plant (Unit-II & III now closed *w.e.f.* 31-10-2019), the workmen are recruited based on qualification, experience and certain basic skill sets at an agreed remuneration/salary as mentioned in their respective appointment letters. He deposed that the wages across the entire workforce are not the same rather there is a wage structure depending on the grade/designation which applies to every individual. He further deposed that the company has annual appraisal system and each and every employee including the workmen are appraised every year through a process of annual appraisal system and depending upon performance during the year, various grades/designation are assigned to every individual and increment are given accordingly. The workmen are governed by the collective bargaining process and have their yearly wage increase bases the negotiated settlement as applicable from time to time. The workers union had submitted the demand notice to the management before the expiry of last settlement on 31-03-2015. The increase based on the last settlement could not be given as workers union *vide* clause 33 of the demand charter dated 05-01-2015 had refused to accept the increase based on last settlement, however, in view of the judgment of the Hon'ble High Court the same has been disbursed to the concerned workmen. He also deposed that the company has been giving the increase in salary over and above the minimum wages to all workmen declared by the government from time to time.

23. During cross-examination, he deposed that the salary is remitted in the account of the workers. He denied that his salary is Rs. Two lakhs and fifty thousand per month and further denied that the workers who have completed more than twenty years of service are getting salary of Rs. 12,000/- to Rs. 17,000/- per month. He denied that the salary of associate at supervisory level is starting from 14,000/- to Rs. 17000/-. He deposed that he has been authorized by the management to depose in this case vide authority letter Ex. RW-2X. He admitted that settlement is due between the parties since April, 2015 and further admitted that Ex. PW-1/D pertains to the period after 01-04-2015. He denied that filling of appraisal form was not a requirement as per settlement Ex. PX and stated that it has been mentioned in Ex. PX that their overall performance would be taken into consideration. He admitted that annual increment is admissible to the workers. Self-stated that the workers who fill the appraisal form and met the parameters of the appraisal they got the annual increment. He denied that the appraisal forms were not filled by the workers from 2012-2015 still the benefits of settlement Ex. PX were extended to them. He admitted that the workers who were not associated with petitioner union are being paid enhanced salary since 2015. He admitted that the respondent has set up a new project at Sanand in Gujrat.

24. This is the entire evidence led by the respondent.

25. The respondent has taken the plea that the petitioner union is not competent to maintain this claim nor they are authorized to file this claim on behalf of workers of the respondent company. The claim of the respondent is that there does not exist any union in the name of Secure Meters Workers Union, Secure Meter Ltd., Unit- II & III, Barotiwala, District Solan, HP nor they could raise industrial dispute in respect of their demands which have been sent to this Court by way of present reference. In view of this claim, it would be apt to refer to cross-examination of RW-1 who is working as Manager with the respondent company. This witness has admitted that the petitioner union is recognized by the respondent company and one long term settlement (Ex. PX) was entered between the respondent management and petitioner union. He has also admitted that this settlement was valid till 31-03-2015. Thus, from the cross-examination of RW-1 it stands established on record that petitioner union is recognized by respondent company and settlement Ex. PX was entered between respondent management and petitioner union as such it does not lie in the mouth of the respondent to say that neither the petitioner union exists nor they are authorized to file the claim on behalf of the workers of respondent company. The petitioner union has placed on record resolution Ex.PW-1/B whereby the President and General Secretary of the workers union were authorized by 249 workers to pursue their demand notice before this Court and to appoint Advocate on behalf of the union.

26. Though, it was argued by the Ld. Counsel for the respondent that the union could only raise the demands for one unit, but they have raised the demands for both the units. Admittedly, the demand notice has been raised by the workers of petitioner union for units nos. II & II of respondent company at Barotiwala, but it has not been disputed by the respondent that both the units are manufacturing the electric meters and it has come in the statement of PW-3 that there are 34 workers of one unit and 167 workers of another unit at Barotiwala. The reference has also been sent to this Cort for deciding the demands raised vide demand notice dated 01.05.2015 for units no. II & III & 2 of respondent company at Barotiwala which reference has not been challenged by the respondent. The workers have also signed the resolution whereby 266 workers have put signatures on the resolution dated 03.04.2016 which clearly suggest that the workers of petitioner union have raised the dispute for both the units of respondent company at Barotiwala as such there is no force in this contention of the Ld. Counsel for respondent.

27. Ld. Counsel for respondent had argued that in view of the provisions of Section 19 of the Act, the petitioner union was required to issue two month's notice in writing of their intention to terminate the settlement Ex. PX and since they have submitted the demand notice Ex. PW-1/D during the operation of settlement Ex. PX the same is hit by the provisions of Section 19 of the Act and reference thus is not maintainable. Ld. Counsel for the respondent had placed reliance on the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as **M/s Shukla Manseta Industries Pvt. Ltd. Vs. The Workmen Employed Under IT (1977) 4 SCC 31** and on the basis of this authority he had argued that reference itself is bad as the earlier settlement which was valid till 31-03-2015 and was in force and there was no legal and valid termination of this settlement in accordance with the provisions of Section 19(2) of the Act. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in this judgment (as cited supra) has observed as under:—

> "**The object of Section 19(2) is to ensure that once a settlement is arrived at their prevails peace, accord and cordiality between the parties during the period agreed upon and if the settlement does not require to be altered for some reason or the other the same climate prevails by extension of the settlement by operation of law. Under Section 19(2), a settlement shall be binding for such period as is agreed upon by the parties and if there is no period mentioned in the agreement, for a period of six months from the date on which the settlement was signed by the parties. With regard to the period of operation of the settlement, the sub-section confers a statutory continuity of the settlement even after expiry of the**

period agreed upon until expiry of two months from the date on which a written notice of the intention to terminate the settlement is given by one party to the other. To avoid uncertainty and speculation Section 19 prescribes a terminus a quo and a terminus ad quem. The notice under this sub section is only for intimation of an intention to terminate the settlement. There is no legal impediment to give advance intimation of the aforesaid intention provided the contractual period of settlement is not thereby affected or curtailed. It is only if a notice under Section 19(2) expires within the period of operation of the settlement such a notice will be invalid under the law. In that event, the settlement will continue to be in operation and any reference by Government of a dispute during the period of settlement will be invalid."

28. Coming to the case in hand there is no termination of earlier settlement rather the petitioner union by raising the present demand notice have raised the demands for the period after earlier settlement ended on 31-03-2015. Simply because they had submitted the present demand notice for further long-term settlement before expiry of the settlement Ex. PX, the same would not be hit by Section 19(2) of the Act. It has come in evidence that petitioner never intended to terminate long term settlement Ex. PX by way of raising the present demand notice after 31-03-2015 as such the petitioner union was not required to fulfil the condition of notice as enumerated under Section 19(2) of the Act. Reliance was also placed on judgment of Hon'ble High Court of Kerla in case titled as **Cochin Shipyard Ltd. Vs. Industrial Tribunal OA No. 997 of 1988 decided on 27.10.1989**, but the facts of this judgment are different from the facts in hand. In that case the workmen had entered into long-term settlement with the respondent company, which was in force for four years and before the expiry of the settlement the union had demanded for increase. As discussed above, the petitioner union have not claimed any benefits for the period of long-term settlement which expire on 31-03-2015, but they have raised the demands after the expiry of period of Ex. PX on 31-03-2015. Moreover, the witness of respondent company (RW-1) has admitted that the demands raised through Ex. PW-1/D were raised for the period after expiry of Ex. PX. He has also admitted that demand notice Ex. PW-1/D had no effect on earlier settlement Ex. PX. He has admitted that long term settlement was due between the petitioner union and respondent management. With the aforesaid statement of RW-1, it stands established that charter of demands has been submitted as the long-term settlement was due after 31-03-2015 between petitioner union and respondent management. It has come in the statement of RW-1 that demands raised through Ex. PW-1/D were raised for the period after the expiry of settlement Ex. PX. Since, the demands were raised for the period after expiry of earlier settlement Ex. PX, the petitioner union was not required to issue a notice in writing to terminate the earlier settlement Ex. PX. Since, the demand notice Ex. PW-1/D was raised for long-term settlement which was due after 31-03-2015 thus it cannot be said that the demands raised by the petitioner union through demand notice dated 05-01-2015 are not legal and justified.

DEMANDS No. 1, 2, 5 and 7

29. Under the above demands the petitioner union had demanded that the salary to all workers should be increased by ` 9000/- per month and after execution of settlement the amount agreed under the settlement be paid in lump sum to the workers. Apart from this, Dearness Allowance to the employees should be linked with the Consumer Price Index fixed by the Government and it should be paid quarterly every year. The petitioner union has also prayed that the Production related annual allowance be paid to all employees and 75% of the amount determined/agreed to be increased in the salary of all employees should be added to their Basic Pay. So far as these demands are concerned, the principles regarding fixation of pay scales and pay have been laid down in several decisions by Hon'ble Supreme Court and Hon'ble High Courts and they apply equally to all industries irrespective of the character of the employer. **The Hon'ble**

Supreme Court In (1972) 3 SCC 552 M/s Unicam Laboratory Ltd., Vs. The workmen, has held as under:—

"70. In the fixation of wages and dearness allowance the legal position is well-established that it has to be done on an industry-cum-region basis having due regard to the financial capacity of the unit under consideration-vide Express Newspapers (Private) Ltd., and Another v. The Union of India and others, Greaves Cotton and Co. and others v. Their Workmen and Bengal Chemical & Pharmaceutical Works Ltd. v. Its Workmen."

71. It has been further stated in Greaves Cotton and Co. and others v. Their Workmen as follows :

"The principle therefore which emerges from these two decisions is that in applying the industry-cum-region formula for fixing wage scales the Tribunal should lay stress on the industry part of the formula if there are a large number of concerns in the same region carrying on the same industry; in such a case in order that production cost may not be unequal and there may be equal competition, wages should generally be fixed on the basis of the comparable industries, namely, industries of the same kind. But where the number of industries of the same kind in a particular region is small it is the region part of the industry-cum-region formula which assumes importance.....

72. It has been further emphasized in Ahmedabad Millowners' Association etc. v. The Textile Labour Association(1) that industrial adjudication should always take into account, when revising the wage structure and granting dearness allowance, the problem of the additional burden to be imposed on the employer and ascertain whether the employer can reasonably be called upon to bear such burden. The principles to be borne in mind have been stated in the said decision as follows :

" It is a long-range, plan; and so, in dealing with this problem, the financial position of the employer must be carefully examined. What has been the progress of the industry in question; what are the prospects of the industry in future; has the industry been making profits; and if yes, what is the extent of profits; what is the nature of demand which the industry expects to secure; what would be the extent of the burden and its gradual increase which the employer may have to face ? These and similar other considerations have to be carefully weighed before a proper wage structure can be reasonably constructed by industrial adjudication.....

73. As pointed out in Greaves Cotton and Co. and others v. Their Workmen (2), one of the principles to be adopted in fixing wages and dearness allowance is that the Tribunal should take into account the, wage scale and dearness allowance prevailing in' comparable concerns carrying on the same industry in the region., The factors which have to be taken into account for ascertaining comparable concerns have also been laid down by this Court.

74. In **Workmen of Balmer Lawrie and Co. v. Balmer Lawrie & Co**., and those principles have been stated as follows "Besides, it is necessary to emphasise that in dealing with the comparable character of industrial undertakings, industrial adjudication does not usually rely on oral evidence alone. This question is considered in the light of material fact and circumstances which are generally proved by documentary evidence. What is the total capital invested by the concern, what is the extent of its business, what is the order of the profits made by the concern, what are the, dividends paid, how many employees are employed by the concern, what is its

standing in the industry to which it belongs, these and other matters have to be examined by industrial adjudication in determining the question as to whether one concern is come parable with another in the matter of fixing wages. Now, it is obvious that these questions cannot be decided merely on the interested testimony either of the workmen, or of the employer and his witnesses'.

75. In Workmen of New Egerton Woollen Mills v. New Egerton Woollen Mills and others(1), the above principles have again been reiterated.

76. From the decisions, referred to above, it follows that two principal factors which must weigh while fixing or revising wage scales and grades are: (1) How the wages prevailing in the establishment in question compare with those given to the workmen of similar grade and scale by similar establishments in the same industry or in their absence in similar establishments in other industries in the region; and (2) What wage scales the establishment in question can pay without any undue strain on its financial resources. The same principles substantially apply when fixing or revising the dearness allowance."

Therefore, in the light of aforesaid principles as laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, it was incumbent upon the petitioner union to lead evidence to prove that as to what were the wages prevailing in the establishment compared, with those given to the workmen of similar grade and scale by similar establishments in the same industry or in their absence in similar establishments in other industries in the region and also to show as to what wages/scales the establishment in question can pay without any undue strain on its financial resources. The petitioner union has led evidence in this regard and examined one Shri Sh. Himanshu Chitkara, who appeared into the witness box as PW-4. For the sake of convenience, the material deposition of this witness in this regard is reproduced again. This witness has stated that *he is working as Employ relation Manager with Mondelezs India Pvt. Ltd., and the company has a unit in Village Sandholi, Baddi, Solan H.P. They have 675 workers which consists of technicians, boiler operators and workers for packing. In the year 2015 the average pay packet of the workers ranged between Rs. 24000/- to 34000/- and as on date the aforesaid range is between Rs. 38000/- to Rs. 50000/-. The company has entered into a long-term settlement with the workers union which is for three years. As per long term settlement they have given the increase of Rs. 5000/- in three years. During cross-examination this witness has stated that Mondlez India Pvt. Ltd., is a Multi-National Company and they have four factories across India. The company has taken over the establishment of Cadbury India Pvt. Ltd. which was more than seventy years old and the annual turnover of the company is around Rs. Six thousand crores. He admitted that the company's pay remuneration to its workers is based on its profits. He admitted that Mondlez India Pvt. Ltd., is a food processing unit. He further admitted that the wages of the employees and categorization is different in different companies*.

30. So far as the statement of PW-4 is concerned since this witness has stated that Mondlez India Pvt. Ltd., is a food processing unit which is Multi National Company having turnover of Rs. Six thousand crores whereas it has come in the evidence of PW-3 that in the year 2019 Unit-III of respondent at Damuwala earned profits of Rs. 4 crores and as per statement Ex. PX-1 as per statement Ex. PX-2, the profit of unit-II situated as Bated was Rs. forty-one crores. Thus, from the statements of PW-3 and PW-4, it is clear that the financial status of both the companies i.e Mondlez India Pvt. Ltd. and respondent company is incomparable in terms of profits and turnover of the company's. Otherwise also Mondlez India Pvt. Ltd. is a food processing unit, whereas the respondent company is manufacturer of electric meters. PW-4 has given statement that in the year 2015 the average pay packet of the workers ranged between Rs. 24000/- to 34000/- and as on date the aforesaid range is between Rs. 38000/- to Rs. 50000/-. No document has been produced on record by PW-4 or by the petitioner union to show that what wages or pay scale to a similar grade

worker was being paid in Mondlez India (P) Ltd. It has come in the statement of PW-3 that as per his knowledge HPL & Landis+Gear are other two companies are working in the vicinity. The petitioner union has chosen to compare their wages with the establishment running a food processing unit rather than comparing the wages/pay scales with similarly situated other industries in the region. Considering the turn-over of Mondlez India (P) Ltd., the scales as sated by PW-4 can only be paid by putting much strain on financial resources of the respondent company. As per the statement of PW-4, an increase of Rs. 5000/- has been given to the workers under a long-term settlement. Petitioner union has not led any evidence that what were the wages of operators in similar establishments in the same industry or in its absence, in similar establishments in other industries in the region. M/s Mondlez India Pvt. Ltd., (having turn over around six thousand crores) cannot be compared with the respondent establishment especially when both the companies i.e respondent and Mondlez India Pvt. Ltd. are not in the same business. The unit relied by the petitioner union as comparable unit cannot be relied as the same is food processing unit having much more turnover than the respondent company. Otherwise also the Hon'ble Apex Court in **2023 LLR 523 case titled as The VVF Ltd., Employees Union Vs. M/s VVF India Ltd., & Anr**., has held that for revision of pay/wages and other facilities, the standard criteria which is followed by the industrial adjudicator is to apply industry-cum-region test, which in substance implies that the prevailing pay and other allowances should be compared with equally placed or similarly situated industrial units in the same region. The settled law is that while determine comparability of units applying the industry-cum-region test, inter alia, the financial capacity of the employer would be a strong factor.

31. The petitioner union has demanded that salary of all workers be increased by Rs. 9000/- per month and payment of settlement amount in lump sum be made to the workers and dearness allowance be linked in the Consumer Price Index (hereinafter to be referred as CPI) fixed by the Government should be paid quarterly every year, production related annual allowance and 75% of amount agreed to be increase in the salary of all employees should be added to their basic pay/salary. The petitioner union has not placed on record any CPI index fixed by the Government to claim DA. Not only this, the petitioner union has not made any justifiable cause for increase of salary by Rs. 9000/- per month. Petitioner union has not led any convincing evidence to justify the claim for raising their salaries by Rs. 9,000/- per month. The respondent company on the other hand has claimed that the respondent is already paying minimum wages to all the workers as such the wages are not required to be increased. It has come in the evidence that other co-workers who have filled appraisal form are getting increased salary/wages. It is evident from order dated 30-05-2019 that effort was made for conciliation for entering into a long-term settlement by the parties upon which this Court has thus ordered that:—

> "In the aforesaid circumstances, let the parties sit across the table and formulate a long-term settlement to be placed before this Court. The Labour-cum-Conciliation Officer, Baddi is directed to assist the parties in formulating the long-term settlement. He shall assist himself right from the very beginning till the termination of the proceedings. The parties and the labour officer are directed to convene the first meeting on 24-06-2019. The long-term settlement be placed on record on ore before the next date. The demands so raised in the notice dated 05-01-2019 shall also be considered during the formulation of long-term settlement. A copy of this order be sent to the Labour Officer, Baddi for necessary compliance."

Though, on this effort made by this Court, no long-term settlement was entered between the parties but the Labour-*cum*-Conciliation Officer, Baddi has submitted his report. The relevant part of the report is reproduced hereunder:

> "**Keeping in view of the above detailed report and as per perusal of the reply and statements given by them during the course it can concluded that worker needs to**

take in to consideration the electronic product life cycle as well as current production forecast of the factory. If union representatives agreed to management offer than they will get average Rs 1.50 Lachs per worker as arrear and around 60-70% salary hike from the current salary. Which according to me is good keeping in view the business forecast. During the conciliation workers are not able to produce any record to justify their salary hike demand".

32. The data was also furnished by the respondent company to Labour-*cum*-Conciliation Officer regarding increase of wages made to the other workers who were not party to present dispute which is annexed with the report of Labour-*cum*-Conciliation Officer. The details of increments given to an individual who has been rated good in both performance and behavior in their annual appraisal cycle have also been furnished. The management had shown its inability to consider the demands of the petitioner union which were more than what they had already given to the other workers/employees, who are not party to the present dispute.

33. It was not disputed by the respondent company that other workers who are not party to present dispute have been given pay hike and petitioner union has also led evidence that the respondent company has not given any increase to 167 workers whereas increase has been given to all other workers who are not party to the present dispute. It is admitted fact that 167 workers have not been paid revised pay since April, 2016. Though the respondent company has taken the plea that since the workers of petitioner union had not filled appraisal form as such they were not given increase in their wages/salaries. The respondent company has not shown to this Court that under Certified Standing Orders, Model Standing Orders or as per the terms of their appointment/employment letters, the workers of petitioner union were required/bound to fill self-appraisal form before increase could be made to the wages of petitioner workers as has been allowed to other workers. In this regard, respondent has relied upon sub clauses क, ख and ग of Clause 4 of previous settlement Ex. PX entered between the parties wherein it has been mentioned that in case the overall performance is average or below average then as per chart shown in clause-4, Rs. 50/- less will be paid to the workers and in case the overall performance is over and above, then the workmen would be paid Rs. 50/- more. Similar notes have been put against sub clauses **ख व ग** Though, there was mention of overall performance of the workers in Ex. PX, but there is no mention that the increase in the salary could only made on filling of appraisal form by the workers. Even, if the workers had not filled the appraisal form, the respondent company could have got their work assessed through their reporting officer(s). There may be a procedure to fill up the appraisal form, but the respondent company has failed to establish on record that it was mandatory requirement for considering the increase/hike in the salaries/wages of workers. The respondent company has paid increased wages to the similarly situated workers and it would be just and proper if the workers of petitioner union are also considered as good in their work, performance and behaviour (except for any individual misconduct as defined in the Certified Standing Orders or Model Standing Orders) and they are also given similar increase as has been given to other similarly situated workers.

34. The data which has been produced by the respondent company during conciliation before Labour-*cum*-Conciliation Officer if taken into consideration and pay scale is allowed to the petitioner workers as has been given to other similarly situated workers, it would be making salary hike of more than 60% from the current salary of the workers of petitioner union. As such the demand of the petitioner union for increase of Rs. 9000/- per month in their salaries/wages is not justifiable. Therefore, keeping in view facts and circumstances since the grouse of the petitioner union is also that the other workers have been paid enhanced wages and they have not been paid enhanced wages as such the respondent company is directed to consider the workers of petitioner union in their work and behavour as good (except for any individual misconduct as defined in the Certified Standing Orders or Model Standing Orders) and they should give similar increase to the

workers of petitioner union as given by the respondent company to the similarly situated workers working with them. Keeping in view the above discussion, the petitioner union is held entitled to increase in salary/wages as well as increments and allowances as paid to other similarly situated co-workers from 01-04-2015, however, it is made clear that if the workers of petitioner union have received any amount under the orders of the Courts, the same would be adjusted in making the final calculation amount to be paid to the workers of petitioner union. The workers of petitioner union are liable to receive the enhanced wages and other admissible benefits as paid to other similarly situated co-workers who are not the part of petitioner union *w.e.f.* 01-04-2015. The arrears shall be paid by the respondent company to the workers of petitioner union within a period of three months from the date of award. The above demands are decided accordingly.

DEMAND No. 3

35. The workers of petitioner union have demanded that yearly Bonus of Rs. 20,000/- should be paid by the Company to all employees whereas the stand taken by the respondent company is that the company has already been making payment of bonus @ 20%, which is maximum bonus to be paid by an employer to its worker as per the provisions of the Payment of Bonus Act, 1965. So far as this demand is concerned, Section 11 of Bonus Act, 1965 deals with the payment of maximum Bonus which is reproduced as under:—

"**Payment of maximum bonus.—(1) Where in respect of any accounting year referred to in section 10, the allocable surplus exceeds the amount of minimum bonus payable to the employees under that section, the employer shall, in lieu of such minimum bonus, be bound to pay to every employee in respect of that accounting; year bonus which shall be an amount in proportion to the salary or wage earned by the employee during the accounting year subject to a maximum of twenty per cent, of such salary or wage.**

(2) In computing the allocable surplus under this section, the amount set on or the amount set off under the provisions of section 15 shall be taken into account in accordance with the provisions of that section."

36. Since, the respondent company has already made a statement that the company is already making the payment of bonus @ 20%, which is maximum bonus to be paid by an employer as such the respondent company cannot be directed to increase the limit of payment of maximum bonus as provided under the aforesaid Section. However, it is left to the respondent company to pay the bonus accordingly as per the provisions of the Act or as is being paid to other similarly situated workers, whichever is on the higher side.

DEMAND No. 4

37. The petitioner union has demanded that the Company should contribute 95% towards canteen Services and the contribution of the workers should be fixed to 5%. In order to justify this demand, the petitioner union has not led any evidence to show that in the region how many factories are providing canteen facility where the company is contributing 95% towards canteen Services and the contribution towards workers has been fixed to 5%. The respondent in its reply though has stated that the management is already providing quality canteen services at the affordable cost to the workers and bearing the financial burden of the same, but they have not specified that what contribution they are making in providing food to the workers. Labour Law Legislation is a beneficial legislation. Considering the profits which the company has gained in the past years as is evident from the statement of RW-3 who in his statement has admitted that as per statement for the year 2019, unit III at Damuwala earned profits amounting to Rs. 40000000/- and as per Ex. PX-1, the loss and profit statement of the unit-II situated at Baddi, the profits of the year

2019 has been recorded as Rs. 410000000, the respondent management can definitely contribute little more than the workers to provide subsidized food to its workers as the workers came from far off places to work for the respondent company. Thus, the respondent company is directed to provide subsidized food to its workers where the contribution of the management would be little more than the contribution of the workers. Ordered accordingly.

DEMAND No. 6

38. The petitioner union has demanded that loan Facility to all employees be provided depending upon their length of service with a minimum of Rs. 50,000/- and maximum of Rs. 5.00 Lakhs. In order to justify this demand, the petitioner union has failed to lead any evidence. There is nothing on record which could go to show that previously such facility was being provided to them and lateron the same has been withdrawn. So far as the loan facility is concerned, it is clear that policy governing company loans to semsites (document which has not been exhibited but annexed in the proposed agreement Ex. RW-1/L) that loan facility is being extended to the workers. As per this document the maximum loan amount is as follows:

"Secure Level G	Rs. 25000/-
Secure Level F	Rs. 35000/-
Secure Level E	Rs. 50000/-
Secure Level D	Rs. 65000/-
Secure Level C	Rs. 75000/-

The petitioner union has failed to place on record any settlement nor they could point out that as per Model Standing Orders, the respondent company can be directed to increase the loan amount to all employees/workers of Rs. 5 lakhs or such amount is being paid by similarly situated industries in region as such the demand raised by the workers of petitioner union in this regard cannot be accepted.

Demand No. 8

39. The petitioner union has made a demand that all employees should be granted PL in place of EL and CL. The petitioner union has also led evidence to the effect that the benefit of PL in place of CL and EL should be granted to all the employees, but the respondent company has denied to grant this benefit to the workers on the ground that there is no provision under law to provide PL in place of EL and CL to the workers. So far as this demand is concerned, it would be beneficial to refer to HP Industrial Establishments (National and Festival Holidays and Casual and Sick Leave) Act, 1969 Act No.7 of 1970. This Act provides for the grant of leaves to the workers working in different establishments in the State of Himachal Pradesh. Sections 3,4,5 and 6 of the aforesaid Act are reproduced as under:

"3. **National and Festival Holidays**.—(1) Every worker shall, in each year, be allowed in such manner, and on such conditions, as may be prescribed- (a) three national holidays of one whole day each on the 26th January, 15th August and 2nd October ; and 1 [(b) five other holidays on any of the festivals specified in the Schedule, out of which one shall be the Himachal Day and the other shall be the Statehood Day.] "

(2) The Government may, by notification, add to or omit from the Schedule any festival, and thereupon the Schedule shall be deemed to be amended accordingly.

4. **Casual and sick leave.—**Every worker shall in each year, be allowed by the employer casual leave for seven days and sick leave for fourteen days in such manner, and on such conditions

(including a condition to the effect that one kind of leave shall not be linked with another kind of leave, whether due under this Act, or under any other law for the time being in force), as may be prescribed.

5. **Wages**.—(1) Notwithstanding any contract to the contrary, every worker shall for each of the national and festival holidays and of the days of casual or sick leave, be paid by the employer wages at a rate equivalent to his average daily wage: Provided that:—

(a) no worker shall be entitled to be paid such wages for any holiday or leave, other than a national holiday, if his name was not on the rolls of the industrial establishment continuously for a period of one month immediately preceding such holiday or leave;

(b) where a worker is entitled to sickness benefit under the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) or sickness allowance under the Plantation Labour Act, 1951 (69 of 1951) he shall not be entitled to be paid such wages for the days of sick leave allowed to him under this Act ; and

(c) where a worker is not entitled to such sickness benefit or sickness allowance, he shall be paid wages for the days of sick leave allowed to him under this Act at a rate equivalent to one-half of his average daily wage.

(2) Where a worker works on any holiday allowed under section 3, he shall, at his option, be entitled to-

(a) twice his average daily wage for that day, or

(b) his average daily wage for that day and a substituted holiday with his average daily wage on any other day within ninety days from the day on which he so works.

Explanation.—For the purposes of this section, the average daily wage of a worker shall be computed on the basis of his total full-time wages during the preceding three months, exclusive of any overtime wages, if any: Provided that the average daily wage of a worker who is paid wages by the day or at piece rate shall be computed on the basis of his wages for the days on which he actually worked during the month immediately preceding such holiday or leave".

40. From the pursual of above Sections of the aforesaid Act, it is clear that there is no provisions to grant of PL in place of EL and CL to the workers. As per aforesaid Act, the workers are only entitled for the leaves specified under the aforesaid Act. It is not the case of the petitioner union that they are not allowed to avail casual or sick leave or National and Festival holidays as defined under the aforesaid Act nor it is the case of petitioner union that they are not paid wages as per Section 5 of the aforesaid Act. The petitioner union has not made complaint to any authority for any contravention of Sections 3, 4 & 5 of the aforesaid Act which is the punishable offence under the Act. The petitioner union has not made out any case that such PL is being allowed to other workers working with the respondent company or in adjourning similarly situated establishments. Since, the respondent has not agreed to provide PL in place of EL and CL and the Act as referred to supra does not provide for any PL for workers, the respondent company cannot be directed to provide PL in place of EL and CL as such the demand no.8 cannot be accepted by this Tribunal and the same is rejected.

DEMANDS No. 9

41. The workers of petitioner union have demanded that the designation of all employees should be converted/changed from 'Operator' to 'Associate' and after re-determining their work norms, they should be given promotion depending upon their qualification and experience. The respondent has taken the plea that the designations of the workers are as per their category and the nature of duties being performed by them. The promotions of the employees are done as per the procedure of the company. For the promotions the qualification, aptitude, skill level, experience of the concerned employee are important parts which are taken care of during the appraisal every year and by not participating in the appraisal process, the workers are denying the company any objective basis for assessment of promotions. So far as this demand is concerned, the workers of petitioner union are also entitled to designation as given to similarly experienced, qualified and similarly situated workers, but the respondent company cannot be directed to change the designation of all the workers from "Operator to Associate". Since, the workers of petitioner union have been allowed similar pay allowances and increments as has been given to other co-workers, who are similarly situated by rating them good in performance and behaviour it would be opt for this Tribunal to direct the respondent company to designate the workers of the petitioner union who are similarly situated with other co-workers by considering their work, behaviour and performance as good (except for any individual misconduct as defined in the Certified Standing Orders or Model Standing Orders) and they should be given similar designations as has been given to other co-workers. However, it is made clear that in future the workers who would not fill the appraisal forms, their work would be assessed by their superiors as per the Policy of the respondent company. The demand is decided accordingly.

DEMAND No. 10

42. By raising this demand, the workers of petitioner union have demanded that all employees should be entitled to be given LTA facility. However, the respondent company has taken the plea that the LTA facility is not statutory obligation and the management is not in a financial position to extend the LTA facility to the workers. Since, the petitioner union has failed to lead any evidence in this regard as such the demand of the LTA facility cannot be accepted.

DEMANDS No. 11, 15, 18 and 27

43. By raising aforesaid demands, the petitioners have demanded that all employees should be paid Night Shift allowance depending upon their duty, The time of 'A', 'B' and 'C' shifts should be fixed as eight hours, In case workers are retained for additional time by the Company then the workers should be paid three times of the monthly salary fixed by the Company for the additional time for which they have been retained and in case workers are retained on holiday, then four times of salary should be paid for such period and if company put the workers to work for additional two hours, then workers should be provided with refreshment for minimum of Rs.15/- and in case additional work for four hours is taken, the worker should be provided with meals by the Company at expenses of the Company.

44. Section 53 of the Factories Act deals with the compensatory holiday, Section 54 of the Factories Act deals with the daily working hours of an adult worker in the factory, Section 57 of the Factories Act deals with Night Shift Allowance and Section 59 of Factories Act, deals with extra wages for over time. The aforesaid Sections reads as under:—

"53. Compensatory holidays.—(1) Where, as a result of the passing of an order or the making of a rule under the provisions of this Act exempting a factory or the workers therein from the provisions of Section 52, a worker is deprived of any of the weekly holidays for which

provision is made in sub-section (1) of that section, he shall be allowed, within the month in which the holidays were due to him or within the two months immediately following that month, compensatory holidays of equal number to the holidays so lost.

(2) The State Government may prescribe the manner in which the holidays for which provision is made in sub-section (1) shall be allowed.

54. Daily hours.—Subject to the provisions of Section 51, not adult worker shall be required or allowed to work in a factory for more than nine hours in any day.

57. Night shifts. Where a worker in a factory works on a shift which extends beyond midnight, --

(a) for the purposes of sections 52 and 53, a holiday for a whole day shall mean in his case a period of twenty-four consecutive hours beginning when his shift ends;

(b) the following day for him shall be deemed to be the period of twenty-four hours beginning when such shift ends, and the hours he has worked after midnight shall be counted in the previous day."

59. Extra wages for overtime. —(1) Where a worker works in a factory for more than nine hours in any day or for more than forty-eight hours in any week, he shall, in respect of overtime work, be entitled to wages at the rate of twice his ordinary rate of wages.

(2) For the purposes of sub-section (1), "ordinary rate of wages" means the basic wages plus such allowances, including the cash equivalent of the advantage accruing through the concessional sale to workers of food grains and other articles, as the worker is for the time being entitled to, but does not include a bonus and wages for overtime work.

(3) Where any workers in a factory are paid on a piece rate basis, the time rate shall be deemed to be equivalent to the daily average of their full-time earnings for the days on which they actually worked on the same or identical job during the month immediately preceding the calendar month during which the overtime work was done, and such time rates shall be deemed to be ordinary rates of wages of those workers:

Provided that in the case of a worker who has not worked in the immediately preceding calendar month on the same or identical job, the time rate shall be deemed to be equivalent to the daily average of the earning of the worker for the days on which he actually worked in the week in which the overtime work was done."

45. The workers of petitioner union are asking for four times salary, refreshment etc., but they are entitled for compensatory holidays, working hours and benefits of night shift allowance and extra wages as provided under Sections 53, 54, 57 and 59 of the Factories Act, 1948. The respondent company is under obligation to comply with the provisions of Sections 53, 54, 57 and 59 of the Factories Act, 1948. Thus, these demands of the petitioner union are accepted purely as per the provisions of Section 53, 54, 57 & 59 of the Factories Act.

DEMAND No. 12

46. The petitioner union has demanded that in case of sudden death or accident of any employee, the Company should pay an amount of Rs. 5.00 Lakh to his family and Insurance Policy of Rs. 10.00 Lakh should be drawn/made for the employees of the Company by the Company. So

far as this demand is concerned, it would be beneficial to refer to circular dated 17-6-2021 of the respondent company which reads as under:

"Increase the Death Benefit from existing limit of Rs. 2.00 Lakh to Rs. 3.00 Lakh from retrospective effect that is 1st April 2020 to nominee of the deceased employee.

Rs. 50,000/- maximum for Skill development of spouse of the deceased employee to be given on registering for any course for skill development, effective 1st April 2021 with a recognized Institution on submission of proof of payment of fees.

Explanation: If the course amount is less than Rs. 50K than actual amount will paid and if the course amount is more than Rs. 50K than 50K will be reimbursed.

The limit of the Education support to deceased employee children is not increased from Rs. 25,000/- to 35,000/- per child per year. This education support will be given till 12th class, effective 1st April 2021.

The mount will be disbursed on submission of proof of payment to the Institution.

Increase the Employee Benevolent monthly Contributions from 1st July 21 for

Level	**Contribution per month**
Secure Level O	**Rs. 300/-**
Secure Level A	**Rs. 275/-**
Secure Level B	**Rs. 250/-**

The contributions for rest of the level remains the same".

From the pursual of letter dated 17-06-2021, it is clear that considerable increase in the death benefits has been made by the respondent company. The demand of petitioner union that in case of sudden death or accident of any employee, the Company should pay an amount of Rs. 5.00 Lakh to his family and Insurance Policy of Rs. 10.00 Lakh should be drawn/made for the employees of the Company by the Company appears to be unreasonable. Since, the considerable increase in the death benefits have been made by the respondent company, the demand raised by the petitioner union cannot be accepted and accordingly the same is rejected.

DEMANDS No. 13 & 14

47. The petitioner union has raised the demands that in case of emergency, all employees should be provided with Company's vehicle at their residences as well as in Company or in case of necessity, this facility should be provided for their native place of residence and all the workers should be issued two sets of uniform and two pair of shoes according to seasons**.** So far as these demands are concerned, the petitioner union has failed to explain in what type of emergency company's vehicle is required to be provided to them from company to their residence and native places. Admittedly, the workers of the petitioner union are coming to the factory of respondent from different places and it would not possible for the respondent company to provide vehicle for each worker of petitioner union to their native place/es or residence as such this demand cannot be accepted and the same is rejected. The other demand of petitioner union regarding issuance of two sets of uniforms and two set of shoes is concerned; in order to justify this demand, no specific evidence has been led by the petitioner union to the effect that earlier also the respondent was providing two pairs of uniforms and shoes to the workers. Moreover, the petitioner union has also not led any evidence to establish that their working conditions are such that they need special type

of shoes and uniform to work inside the premises of the respondent company as such both the demands of petitioner union are rejected.

DEMAND No. 16

48. Through this demand the workers of petitioner union have demanded that the problems of all employees relating to ESI should be solved by the HR Department at its level. However, the respondent company has taken the stand that HR department of respondent is already extending help to the employees, in case they have any problem which can be solved at their end, however, in case the employees have any issue with ESI Corporation and their system, it cannot be solved by the HR department as it has no control over external agency. So far as this demand is concerned, since ESI Corporation is not controlled by the respondent company such direction cannot be issued by the Court as such this demand is rejected.

DEMAND No. 17

49. The petitioner union has demanded that all employees suffer problems several times due to weak communication system of the Company. Therefore, all employees should be permitted to bring their mobile phones along with them. So far as this demand is concerned, it is for the respondent company to permit or not permit the workers to bring their phones inside the work place. The respondent company though has taken the plea that President and General Secretary of the petitioner union are permitted to carry their mobile phones inside the premises and in case of emergency they can easily contact the concerned workman. Apart from this the respondent company has also taken the plea that there are fixed land line phones in the department which are being used by all the employee, when needed and there is no justification in the demand raised by the workers of petitioner union to permit them to bring and use the mobile phones while working inside the factory premises.

50. It is admitted fact that the respondent company is a manufacturer of electric meters and it would not safe for all the workers to use mobile phones while manufacturing electric meter. However, the respondent company can be directed to provide two phone numbers either mobile of landline to the workers and convey those numbers to the workers either by pasting phone numbers on notice board or otherwise in writing, on which the family members of petitioner union can contact them in case of emergency. Thus, demand raised by the workers of petitioner union is decided accordingly.

DEMAND No. 19

51. The petitioner union has raised the demand that all employees should be provided with Bus facility to Nalagarh and Pinjore. The petitioner union has claimed that earlier the bus facility was provided to them. Whereas the plea of the respondent company in this regard is that earlier the transport allowance was provided to the workers but the same has merged with the other allowances of workers at the time of restructuring their wages. The respondent company has not come with any evidence showing that the transport allowance has merged with the other allowances of the workers. It is also the case of the petitioner union that the bus facility is being provided to the officers but the respondent company has taken the pela that such facility is being provided to the officers as they are paying for the same.

52. The workers of the respondent company are coming to their work place from different parts of District Solan, nearby Districts and States and it may not be feasible for the respondent to provide busses/transport facility to its workers at their door steps. It is also not feasible for the respondent company to hire number of buses/taxis from different places, therefore, it would be in

the interest of justice instead of providing bus facility to all workers, the respondent company is directed to pay some transportation allowance to its workers. Keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the considered view that a sum of Rs. 500/- as transport allowance to each worker can be allowed in favour of all the workers of respondent company. Accordingly, it is ordered that respondent company shall pay a sum of Rs. 500/- per month to each worker from the date of award. The demand as aforesaid is decided accordingly.

DEMAND No. 20

53. The workers of petitioner union have also demanded that all employees should be paid allowance on the basis of their monthly attendance. An employee with 100% attendance should be paid a minimum of Rs. 500/- as allowance in addition to his salary. So far as this demand is concerned, there are no basis for directing the respondent to pay Rs. 500/- for 100% attendance in addition to salary. It is only the discretion of respondent company to award an employee for his performance and attendance. Moreover, it is the duty of individual worker to remain punctual, honest and regular while performing his duties. The respondent company cannot be directed to pay Rs. 500/- for 100% attendance. It is the prerogative of the respondent to award its employee for 100% attendance as such this demand of workers is left at the discretion of the respondent management.

DEMAND No. 21

54. The petitioner union has demanded that all bye-laws/Rules of the Company should be implemented equally and impartially on all employees without bias. So far as this demand is concerned, I am of the considered opinion that the Bye-laws/Rules of the company should be implemented equally and impartially on all employees without any biasness.

DEMAND No. 22

55. By raising demand no. 22, the petitioner union has demanded that every month four gate-passes be issued on personal request/necessity and two gate-passes be issued by Company to every employee, but in support of this demand no rules have been brought to the notice of this Tribunal whereby such directions could be issued to the respondent company. The respondent company has denied the demand of the petitioner union by stating that the gate passes are issued to the workers in emergent situations and the same cannot be claimed as a matter of right. Since, in case of emergency the gate passes are being issued to the workers as such the demand raised by the workers is not genuine. In case the respondent company is directed to issue gate passes on personal request/necessity it would definitely hamper the working atmosphere of the company as such this demand is rejected.

DEMAND No. 23

56. Through demand no.23, the petitioner union has demanded that no employee should be put to work from one unit to other without proper transfer and in case the employee is deputed from one Department to other Department, then the work norms should be given to such employee in writing. The conditions of service of the workers/employees are either governed by the appointment letter or by Certified Standing Orders or Model Standing Orders. Neither the appointment letters of all the workers have been placed on record nor the Certified Standing Orders or Model Standing Orders have been placed on record. As such this demand would be dealt by the management as per the provisions of the Certified Standing Order or Model Standing Orders whichever is applicable or as per the terms and conditions of the appointment letter. The demand is decided accordingly.

DEMAND No. 24

57. The petitioner union has demanded that annual working days of all employees should be fixed as 240 days which should include his own leaves, Govt, holidays and he should be entitled to ESI Medical facility for this period. This demand cannot be accepted as the respondent company cannot be directed to fix working days as 240 days in a calendar year of 360 days including the holidays, leaves and entitlement of ESI medical facility for this period, as such this demand is also rejected.

DEMANDS No.25 & 26

58. The workers of petitioner union have also demanded that the Executive Committee Members of the Union should be provided/entitled to official leave and official gate-pass for any matter concerning the Union and Provision should be made for holiday to the worker on the eve of International Workers' Day every year. So far as these demands are concerned, neither the Factories Act nor HP Industrial Establishments (National and Festival Holidays and Casual and Sick Leave) Act, 1969 Act No. 7 of 1970, specifies such privilege to the union members. In the absence of any rules such privileges cannot be allowed. Furthermore, there is no provision under law for declaring the holiday on International Workers' Day every year as such both these demands raised by the union are hereby rejected.

DEMAND No. 28

59. Under demand no. 28, the petitioner union has demanded that the Workers and the Management, both are in favour of maintaining discipline. In case Company institute/takes any disciplinary action or any other proceedings are instituted against any employee then the Members of the Executive Committee should also be associated with the same. So far as this demand is concerned, the workers as well as management are bound to maintain discipline in work place. However, there is no provision under law regarding association of members of executive committee during enquiry against any worker. The Hon'ble Apex Court in case titled as **N. Kalindi and Others Vs. Tata Locomotive and Engineering Co. Ltd., Jamshedpur, 1960 SCC Online SC 75** has held that "**a workman against whom the enquiry is being held by the management has no right to be represented at such enquiry by a representative of his Union; though of course an employer in his discretion can and may allow his employee to avail himself of such assistance".**

60. Judgment in N. Kalindi's case was followed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as **M/s Brooke bond India Pvt. Ltd., Banglore Vs. S.Subba Raman and Another, 1961 SCC Online SC 6** wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court held that:

" 4. The Commissioner of Labour has held that the refusal of the Enquiry Officer to permit counsel in one case and an outsider in the other was unjustified and therefore there was no full and fair enquiry into the charges against the two employees. He therefore refused to give the permission as prayed.

5. The matter is now concluded by the decision of this Court in Kalindi v. Tata Locomotive and Engineering Co. Ltd.. In that case it was held that-

> **"A workman against whom an enquiry is being held by the management has no right to be represented at such enquiry by a representative of his union, though the employer in his discretion, can and may allow him to be so represented.... and it cannot be said that in any enquiry against a workman natural justice demands that he should be represented by a representative of his union."**

6. In the present case the two employees even went further; one of them wanted to be represented through counsel while the other wanted to be represented through an outsider. Neither of them apparently wanted to be represented by somebody from the union. In view therefore of the decision in Kalindi's case we cannot agree that as a counsel or an outsider was not allowed to appear on behalf of the employees there was no fair or full enquiry in the case. The enquiry proceedings show that after the workmen withdrew from the enquiry the enquiry officer carried on the enquiry ex parte as he could not do otherwise and examined a large number of witnesses. Thereafter he recorded his conclusions and held the charges proved. In the circumstances there was nothing more that the Enquiry Officer could do and the conclusion of the Commissioner of Labour that the enquiry in the two cases was not full and fair must fail. In the circumstances this is a proper case in which the permission asked for should have been granted. We therefore allow the appeal, set aside the order of the Commissioner of Labour and grant the permission to the appellant under Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act to dismiss the two respondents. In the circumstances we pass no order as to costs".

61. It has been held by the Hon'ble Apex Court in case titled as **Indian Overseas bank Vs. Indian Overseas bank Officers' Association and Another, 2001 (9) SCC 540** that right to be represented in domestic enquiry is not absolute right. The relevant para of the judgment is reproduced as under:

"6. **We have carefully considered the submissions made as above. The issue ought to have been considered on the basis of the nature and character or the extent of rights, if any, of an officer-employee to have, in a domestic-disciplinary enquiry, the assistance of someone else to represent him for his defence in contesting the charges of misconduct. This aspect has been the subject matter of consideration by this Court on several occasions and it has been categorically held that the law in this country does not concede an absolute right of representation to an employee in domestic enquiries as part of his right to be heard and that there is no right to representation by somebody else unless the rules or regulation and standing orders, if any, regulating the conduct of disciplinary proceedings specifically recognize such a right and provide for such representation. [N. Kalindi & Others vs M/s Tata Locomotive & Engineering Co. Ltd., Jamshedpur (AIR 1960 SC 914);** Dunlop Rubber Co. (India) Ltd. vs Their Workmen **(AIR 1965 SC 1392);** Crescent Dyes and Chemicals Ltd. vs Ram Naresh Tripathi **(**1993(2) SCC 115) and Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd. vs Maharashtra General Kamgar Union & Others **(1999(1) SCC 626]. Irrespective of the desirability or otherwise of giving the employees facing charges of misconduct in a disciplinary proceeding to ensure that his defence does not get debilitated due to inexperience or personal embarrassments, it cannot be claimed as a matter of right and that too as constituting an element of principle of natural justice to assert that a denial thereof would vitiate the enquiry itself**.

Similar is the judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as **Cipla Ltd., and Others Vs. Ripu Daman Bhanot and another (1999) 4 SCC 188** wherein the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held as under:

"13. **In N.** Kalindi and Ors. vs. Tata Locomotive & Engineering Company Ltd.**, AIR 1960 SC 914 = 1960 (3) SCR 407, it was held that a workman against whom a departmental enquiry is held by the Management has no right to be represented at such enquiry by an outsider, not even by a representative of his Union though the Management may in its discretion allow the employee to avail of such assistance. So also in** Dunlop Rubber Company vs. Workmen**, it was laid down that an employee has no right to be represented in the disciplinary proceedings by another person unless the Service Rules specifically provided for**

the same. A Three-Judge Bench of this Court in Crescent Dyes and Chemicals Ltd. vs. Ram Naresh Tripathi**, laid down that the right to be represented in the departmental proceedings initiated against a delinquent employee can be regulated or restricted by the Management or by the Service Rules. It was held that the right to be represented by an advocate in the departmental proceedings can be restricted and regulated by statutes or by the Service Rules including the Standing Orders, applicable to the employee concerned. The whole case law was reviewed by this Court in** Bharat Petroleum Corporation Ltd. vs. Maharashtra Genl**. Kamgar Union & Ors., it was held that a delinquent employee has no right to be represented by an advocate in the departmental proceedings and that if a right to be represented by a co-workman is given to him, the departmental proceedings would not be bad only for the reason that the assistance of an advocate was not provided to him**".

62. Therefore, keeping in view the law laid down (supra), it is abundantly clear that in case Company institute/takes any disciplinary action or any other proceedings are instituted against any employee/worker, the worker/employee has the right to take the assistance of defence assistant during enquiry, but the Members of the Executive Committee cannot be allowed to be associated with the same as a matter of rights. As such the demand of the petitioner union is not justified and is accordingly rejected.

DEMAND No. 29

63. The petitioner union has also demanded that the workers should be paid higher charges for Hotel and DA in case of tour relating to the work of the Company. The petitioner union has not explained that what allowances they are getting and how much high charges for hotel are required. The petitioner union has not led any evidence that what amount for hotel charge and DA during tour is being paid to the other workers and how much increase is justified nor any evidence has been led that other similarly situated industries are providing higher DA and hotel charges to its workers during tours**.** Admissible DA and Hotel charges are required to be paid as per the policy of the respondent company. Therefore, the demand raised by the petitioner union is hereby rejected.

DEMAND No. 30

64. The workers of petitioner union have demanded that all workers are in favour of healthy atmosphere in the Company. Separate Smoking Zone should be created/fixed in the Company for employees who have the habit of smoking in order to keep the atmosphere healthy. So far as this demand is concerned, this Tribunal cannot lose site of the fact that the respondent company is manufacturing electric meter. Considering the safety and security of the co-workers and that of the respondent company, the workers of petitioner union cannot be allowed to smoke even in separate smoking zone in the factory premises as sch this demand raised by the petitioner union is rejected.

DEMAND No. 31

65. The petitioner union has also demanded that ATM facility should be provided in the Company premises. So far as this demand is concerned the respondent company is manufacturing electric meters and they are not in the business of Banking as such the respondent company cannot be directed to open ATM in the factory premises. The respondent company is having no control over the Bankers to direct them to open ATM in the factory premises. However, the company is left at its own discretion to provide space for opening of ATM if the some bank agrees to open its ATM in the company premises. The demand raised by the workers union is decided accordingly.

DEMAND No. 32

66. The petitioner union has demanded that RMS or M.B.B.S. Doctor should be made available in the Company to provide First Aid in the Company premises. At this stage it would be beneficial to refer to Section 45 0f the Factories Act, which reads as under:

"45. **First-aid appliances**.—(1) There shall in every factory be provided and maintained so as to be readily accessible during all working hours first-aid boxes or cupboards equipped with the prescribed contents, and the number of such boxes or cupboards to be provided and maintained shall not be less than one for every one hundred and fifty workers ordinarily employed 1 [at any one time] in the factory. 2 [(2) Nothing except the prescribed contents shall be kept in a first-aid box or cupboard. (3) Each first-aid box or cupboard shall be kept in the charge of a separate responsible person 3 [who holds a certificate in first-aid treatment recognized by the State Government] and who shall always be readily available during the working hours of the factory.] 4 [(4) In every factory wherein more than five hundred workers are 5 [ordinarily employed] there shall be provided and maintained an ambulance room of the prescribed size, containing the prescribed equipment and in the charge of such medical and nursing staff as may be prescribed 6 [and those facilities shall always be made readily available during the working hours of the factory."

As per aforesaid provision of law, it is mandatory for respondent company to keep first aid box in the premises, however, since the strength of workers of respondent company is less then 500 as such the respondent company cannot be directed to appoint Doctor and nursing staff in the company premises. It is the claim of the respondent that the best possible First-Aid is available in the factory premises and the company also facilitates the injured or sick workers by providing them the transport facility to the ESI hospital/dispensary apart from calling doctor time to time. Therefore, this demand of petitioner union is hereby rejected.

Demand No. 33

67. The workers of petitioner union have demanded that this settlement is applicable from April, 2015. In this no term of settlement from the previous settlement from workers' side shall be recognized/applicable. So far as this demand is concerned, since the workers have raised fresh set of demands by way of demand notice Ex. PW-1/D which is being decided through the present award, obviously the previously settlement Ex. PX would thus come to an end. The demand is decided accordingly.

DEMAND No. 34

68. Under demand no.34, the petitioner union has demanded that every employee should be extended the facility of Leave Travel Concession at Company expenses twice a year. In order to justify this demand noting has been brought to the notice of this Tribunal. Neither any bye-laws of the company in this regard have been produced nor the petitioner union has led any evidence to suggest that such facility is being provided to other employees/workers or such facility was earlier provided by the company as such the demand raised by the petitioner union is hereby rejected.

DEMAND No. 35

69. The petitioner union has also demanded that in order to improve the working of the Workers in the Company, proper working atmosphere be provided to the workers. So far as this demand is concerned, it is the duty of respondent management to improve the working conditions of the workers in the company. The petitioner union has failed to provide list of immunities they

need for improving the working atmosphere of the respondent. However, this Tribunal is of the considered opinion that separate clean toilets for ladies and gents, clean drinking water, clean working place should be provided to the workers. If the same have not been provided to the workers, the respondent company is directed to provide the same to the workers.

70. Therefore, keeping in view my foregoing discussion and decision on demand charter raised by the petitioner union, the reference received from the appropriate government for adjudication is partly allowed in favour of the workers of petitioner union. Both these issues are decided accordingly.

ISSUSE No. 3

71. So far as issue no. 3 is concerned, the respondent has not led any evidence to establish on record that as to how the present reference is not maintainable. Moreover, in view of my findings on issues no.1 & 2 above, I find nothing wrong with this reference which is perfectly maintainable in the present form. The point no. 3 is answered in negative.

RELIEF:

72. As a sequel to my aforesaid findings on issues no. 1 to 3, the workers of petitioner union are entitled to following relief(s):

1. **The respondent company is directed to consider the workers of petitioner union in their work and behavour as good (except for any individual misconduct as defined in the Certified Standing Orders or Model Standing Orders) and the company should give similar increase to the workers of petitioner union as given by the respondent company to the similarly situated workers working with them. The petitioner union is held entitled to increase in salary/wages as well as increments and allowances as paid to other similarly situated co-workers from 01-04-2015, however, it is made clear that if the workers of petitioner union have received any amount under the orders of the Courts, the same would be adjusted in making the final calculation amount to be paid to the workers of petitioner union. The workers of petitioner union are liable to receive the enhanced wages and other admissible benefits as paid to other similarly situated co-workers who are not the part of petitioner union w.e.f. 01-04-2015. The arrears shall be paid by the respondent company to the workers of petitioner union within a period of three months from the date of award**.

2. **So far as the demand of payment of maximum bonus is concerned, it is left to the respondent company to pay the bonus accordingly as per the provisions of the Bonus Act or as is being paid to other similarly situated workers, whichever is from the higher side.**

3. **The respondent company is directed to provide subsidized food to its workers where the contribution of the management would be little more than the contribution of the workers.**

4. **Since, the workers of petitioner union have been allowed similar pay allowances and increments as has been given to other co-workers, who are similarly situated by rating them good in performance and behaviour, the respondent company is directed to designate the workers of the petitioner**

union who are similarly situated with other co-workers by considering their work, behaviour and performance as good (except for any individual misconduct as defined in the Certified Standing Orders or Model Standing Orders) and they should be given similar designations as has been given to other co-workers. However, it is made clear that in future the workers who would not fill the appraisal forms their work would be assessed by their superiors as per the Policy of the respondent company.

5. **So far as demands no11, 15, 18 and 27 are concerned, in this regard the respondent company is directed to comply with the provisions of Sections 53, 54, 57 and 59 of the Factories Act, 1948 and the above demands of petitioner union are accepted purely as per the provisions of Sections 53, 54, 57 & 59 of the Factories Act.**

6. **The respondent company is directed to provide two phone numbers either mobile or landline to the workers and convey those numbers to the workers either by pasting phone numbers on notice board or otherwise in writing on which the family members of the petitioner union can contact them in case of emergency.**

7. **The respondent company is directed to pay a sum of Rs. 500/- as transport allowance to each worker working with the respondent company from the date of award.**

8. **The demand of petitioner union for payment of Rs. 500/- for 100% attendance, is concerned, it is the prerogative of the respondent to award its employee for 100% attendance as such this demand of workers is left at the discretion of the respondent management.**

9. **Demand no.23 would be dealt by the management as per the provisions of the Certified Standing Orders or Model Standing Orders whichever is applicable or as per the terms and conditions of the appointment letter.**

10. **Demand no. 31 has been left to the discretion of the respondent company. The respondent company at its own discretion may provide the space for opening of ATM if any banker agrees to open its ATM in the company premises.**

11. **The respondent company is directed to provide separate clean toilets for ladies and gents, clean drinking water and clean working place, if the same are already not provided to the workers.**

12. **Both the parties are directed to obey the bye-laws/Rules, Certified Standing Orders or Model Standing orders whichever is applicable to the respondent company and the same should be implemented equally and impartially on all employees/workers without any biasness.**

13. **After coming into force of this award, the terms of earlier settlement Ex. PX thus would come to an end.**

Except, aforesaid relief, the other demands raised by the workers of petitioner union are rejected. The reference is answered in the aforesaid terms.

72. Let a copy of this award be communicated to the appropriate Government for publication in the official gazette. The file after due completion be tagged with the main case file.

Announced in the open Court today on this 2nd day of April, 2026.

Sd/-
(ANUJA SOOD),
Presiding Judge,
Industrial Tribunal-cum- *Labour Court,*
Shimla (H.P.).

HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA- 171 001

NOTIFICATION

Shimla the 26th May, 2025

No. HHC/GAZ/14-388/2018.—Hon'ble the Chief Justice has been pleased to grant 15 days' paternity leave *w.e.f.* 29-05-2026 to 12-06-2026 with permission to suffix 2nd Saturday and Sunday falling on 13-06-2026 and 14-06-2026, respectively, in favour of Sh. Raghav Gupta, Civil Judge-*cum*-JMFC, Bilaspur, H.P.

Certified that Sh. Raghav Gupta is likely to join the same post and at the same station from where he proceeds on leave, after expiry of the above period of leave.

Also certified that Sh. Raghav Gupta would have continued to hold the post of Civil Judge-*cum*-JMFC, Bilaspur, but for his proceeding on leave for the above period.

By order,

Sd/-
Registrar General.

HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH, SHIMLA- 171 001

NOTIFICATION

Shimla the 30th May, 2026

No. HHC/GAZ/14-52/74-VII.—In the interest of administration, following transfers and postings of the members of H.P. Judicial Service in the cadre of Senior Civil Judges are hereby ordered with immediate effect:—

1. Ms. Vibhuti Bahuguna, Civil Judge (Leave/Training Reserve), High Court of H.P., Shimla is transferred and posted as Mobile Traffic Magistrate, Chamba.

2. Dr. Parth Jain, Mobile Traffic Magistrate, Chamba is transferred and posted as Civil Judge-*cum*-JMFC-II, Dharamshala.

Note : Both the Judicial Officers under transfer shall join their respective place(s) of posting on or before 5th June, 2026.

By order of Hon'ble High court of Himachal Pradesh,

Sd/-
Registrar General.

HOME DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 29th May, 2026

No. Home (A)B(3)/1/2019.—In pursuance to the judgment dated 01-09-2025 passed by Hon'ble High Court in CWPOA No. 2205 of 2020-titled as Rakesh Kumar *Vs.* State of HP & Ors. and on the recommendations of the Review Departmental Promotion Committee, the Governor, Himachal Pradesh, is pleased to order the promotion of **Sh. Rakesh Kumar,** Personal Assistant to the post of Private Secretary (Class-I- Gazetted) *w.e.f.* 13-08-2025 (on notional basis) *i.e.* from the date of his immediate junior namely Sh. Sandeep Singh promoted as Private Secretary and from the date of his joining as Private Secretary (on actual) in the pay scale as per Rule 3(j) of the HPCS (Revised Pay) Rule, 2022 (Level-16 in the pay matrix) in Police Department, Himachal Pradesh, on regular basis, in public interest.

The above officer will be on probation for a period of two years or till retirement whichever is earlier. The Officer shall also exercise option for fixation of pay under the provision of FR-22 within a period of one month from the date of issuing of this notification. The posting orders shall be issued separately.

This issues with the prior approval of the State Election Commission, Himachal Pradesh obtained *vide* their letter No. SEC(F)1-48/2025-L-8628, dated 26-05-2026.

By order,

KAMLESH KUMAR PANT, IAS,
Addl. Chief Secretary (Home).

TRANSPORT DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171 002, the 2nd June, 2026

No. TPT-C(9)-4/2003.—The Governor, Himachal Pradesh in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (6) of Section-41 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 (Act No. 59 of 1988) and all other powers enabling him in this behalf is pleased to allot/release registration marks **HP-34 G alongwith Serial No. 0001 to 9999** to the Registering & Licensing Authority Kullu,

District Kullu, Himachal Pradesh for registration of motor vehicles with effect from the publication of this notification in the H.P. Rajpatra (e-Gazette) in the public interest.

By order,

R.D. NAZEEM, I.A.S.,
Additional Chief Secretary (Transport).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-2, the 2nd June, 2026

No. PWD-C (E-270859).—The Governor of Himachal Pradesh is pleased to notify the Standing Operating Procedure (SOP) for flawless working of the use of plastic material in Bituminous Roads in the State of Himachal Pradesh, as following:-

1. The concerned PWD divisions shall communicate in writing to the Urban Local Bodies (ULBs) in their jurisdiction under intimation to Urban Development Department, about the quantum (in tons) of clean waste plastic required in each financial year for the construction of bituminous roads.

1.1 The PWD officials will visit the Urban Local Bodies (ULBs) within 15 days of the above communication from whom waste plastic is required. PWD shall train the ULB/ULBs on the type of waste plastic they have to collect/sort that can be utilized to construct a bituminous road by PWD. The Commissioners/Senior Executive Officer/ Executive Officer/Secretary of ULBs alongwith sanitary supervisors, sanitary inspectors, sanitary workers shall be part of the training program.

1.2 Urban Local Bodies (ULBs) shall communicate in writing to concerned PWD officials, as and when waste plastic is sorted as per the required quantum and as well as of specified characteristic conveyed to them during the training program under intimation to Urban Development Department.

1.3 A Joint inspection of plastic waste collected by Urban Local Bodies (ULBs) will be conducted by Executive Engineer HPPWD under whose jurisdiction ULB falls and Commissioners/Senior Executive Officer/Executive Officer/Secretary of ULBs within one week of communication received from ULB on the availability of waste plastic. The report of Joint Inspection will be submitted to Zonal Chief Engineers HP PWD under intimation to Urban Development Department.

1.4 The inspection report shall also be shared with the State Department of Environment, Science, Technology & Climate Change (DEST&CC) and Himachal Pradesh State Pollution Control Board (HPSPCB) to track utilization of plastic waste and to support environmental monitoring.

1.5 The record of quantity and type of plastic waste inspected and approved shall be maintained digitally for transparency and monitoring of plastic waste utilization. Communications in this regard shall also be endorsed to State Department of

Environment, Science, Technology & Climate Change (DEST&CC) and Himachal Pradesh State Pollution Control Board (HPSPCB) for monitoring of plastic waste utilization under Plastic Waste Management Rules, 2016.

2. The following plastic waste materials recommended for use in Bituminous Road Mixes as per IRC: SP98-2020 will be sorted/segregated from total plastic waste by the Urban Local Body (ULB):-

(i) Carry bags
(ii) Sacks
(iii) Milk Pouches
(iv) Cosmetics and detergent bottles

2.1 Rigid plastic shall not be used as per IRC code. Flexible packaging waste material as mentioned above shall only be accepted for use in Bituminous Roads.

2.2 Black coloured waste plastic material/film shall not be used as per IRC code because it is a result of repeated recycling.

3. Dust and other impurities in above sorted waste plastic should not be more than 1.0% (by weight of plastic). Hence, the sorted waste plastic materials shall be cleaned by the Urban Local Body (ULB).

4. The sorted and cleaned waste plastic shall be shredded in sizes ranging between 2.36 mm and 600 microns with a maximum length of 2.36 mm and maximum width of 2.00 mm. Oversized shredded plastic shall be rejected. The ULBs shall ensure basic segregation before handing over the plastic waste.

5. The shredded waste plastic shall be lifted by the Executive Engineer of HPPWD (B&R) under whose jurisdiction the Urban Local Body (ULB) falls. The quantity lifted from ULBs shall be properly documented and maintained.

5.1 The concerned Executive Engineer shall ensure that cleaned plastic waste shredded in size mentioned in S.N. (4) is only used in the bituminous roads. If the cleaned, shredded plastic waste lifted from Urban Local Body (ULB) is over sized, then the same shall be shredded into specified size by HPPWD by using their available shredders.

6. As per their requirement, the other Executive Engineers of HPPWD will collect shredded plastic waste from the nearby Executive Engineers of HPPWD who have lifted shredded waste plastic from Urban Local Body (ULB).

6.1 Inter-division transfer records of lifted shredded waste plastic shall be documented and maintained to ensure accurate accounting of plastic waste utilization.

7. The shredded plastic wastes shall be used by Executive Engineers of HPPWD in surface Bituminous Courses for different categories of roads as per standard guidelines.

8. The quantity of shredded waste plastic to be added by HPPWD to the aggregates is 8% by weight of Bitumen for preparation/laying of Bituminous Mixes for surface courses as per guidelines of IRC: SP 98-2020.

9. All the Executive Engineers of HP PWD shall submit monthly report on prescribed formats through Zonal Chief Engineers under intimation to Urban Development Department, State Department of Environment, Science, Technology & Climate Change (DEST&CC) and Himachal Pradesh State Pollution Control Board (HPSPCB) regarding:—

(a) Quantity of waste plastic (shredded) collected from Urban Local Body
(b) Detail/length of Bituminous Roads constructed using waste plastic

10. A training module shall be prepared by HPPWD, which shall include environmental safeguards, suggestion standards and safe handling practices for plastic waste.

Sd/-

(DEVESH KUMAR),
Principal Secretary (PW).

पंचायती राज विभाग

अधिसूचना

शिमला–09, 01 जून, 2026

संख्याः पीसीएच–एचए (1) 4/2006–III–पेसा–27810–27968.—हिमाचल प्रदेश के राज्यपाल, हिमाचल प्रदेश पंचायती राज अधिनियम, 1994 की धारा 186 द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, इस विभाग की अधिसूचना संख्या–पी0सी0एच0–एच0ए(1)4/2006–111–45285–307, तारीख 26 मार्च, 2011 द्वारा अधिसूचित और राजपत्र हिमाचल प्रदेश में तारीख 01 अप्रैल, 2011 को प्रकाशित हिमाचल प्रदेश पंचायती राज (अधिसूचित क्षेत्रों पर विस्तार) नियम, 2011 का और संशोधन करने के लिए निम्नलिखित नियम बनाने का प्रस्ताव करते हैं और उन्हें जनसाधारण की सूचना के लिए उपरोक्त अधिनियम की धारा 186 की उप–धारा (3) के अधीन यथापेक्षित राजपत्र (ई–गजट), हिमाचल प्रदेश में एतदद्वारा प्रकाशित किया जाता है;

यदि इन नियमों द्वारा सम्भाव्य प्रभावित होने वाले किसी व्यक्ति के कोई आक्षेप या सुझाव हैं, तो वह उसे/उन्हें इन प्रारूप नियमों के राजपत्र (ई–गजट), हिमाचल प्रदेश में प्रकाशन की तारीख से तीस दिन की अवधि के भीतर निदेशक, पचायती राज, हिमाचल प्रदेश एस०डी०ए० कॉम्प्लेक्स कसुम्पटी, शिमला 9 को भेज सकेगा;

उपरोक्त विनिर्दिष्ट अवधि के भीतर प्राप्त आक्षेप/सुझाव यदि कोई हों, पर इन प्रारूप नियमों को अन्तिम रूप देने से पूर्व राज्य सरकार द्वारा सम्यक रूप से विचार किया जाएगा, अर्थातः–

प्रारूप नियम

1. संक्षिप्त नाम और प्रारम्भ.—(1) इन नियमों का संक्षिप्त नाम हिमाचल प्रदेश पंचायती राज (अधिसूचित क्षेत्रों पर विस्तार) संशोधन नियम, 2026 है।

(2) ये नियम राजपत्र (ई–गजट), हिमाचल प्रदेश में प्रकाशन की तारीख से प्रवृत्त होंगे।

2. नियम 6 का संशोधन.—हिमाचल प्रदेश पंचायती राज (अधिसूचित क्षेत्रों पर विस्तार) नियम, 2011 के नियम 6 के उप–नियम (2) के स्थान पर निम्नलिखित रखा जाएगा, अर्थात्:–

"सम्बद्ध ग्राम सभा के आज्ञापक परामर्श के पश्चात् और हिमाचल प्रदेश भूमि अन्तरण (विनियमन) अधिनियम, 1968 की धारा 3 के उपबंधों के अनुरूप के सिवाय अनुसूचित जनजाति से संबंधित किसी व्यक्ति द्वारा भूमि या उसमें किसी प्रकार के हित का अन्तरण प्रभावी नहीं होगा।"।

आदेश द्वारा,

सचिव (पंचायती राज)।

———————

*[Authoritative English text of this Department Notification Number PCH-HA (1)4/2006-III-PESA-*27810-27968 *dated 01-06-2026 as required under clause (3) of Article 348 of the Constitution of India].*

PANCHAYATI RAJ DEPARTMENT

NOTIFICATION

Shimla-171 009, the 1st June, 2026

No. PCH-HA (1)4/2006 -III-PESA-27810-27968.—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 186 of the Himachal Pradesh Panchayati Raj Act, 1994 (Act No. 4 of 1994), the Governor, Himachal Pradesh, proposes to make the following rules further to amend the Himachal Pradesh Panchayati Raj (Extension to the Scheduled Areas) Rules, 2011 notified *vide* this Department notification No. PCH-HA (1) 4/2006-III-45285-307, dated 26th March, 2011 and published in the Rajpatra, Himachal Pradesh on 01-04-2011 and the same are hereby published in the Rajptra, Himachal Pradesh, for the information of the general public as required under sub-section (3) of Section 186 of the above Act;

If any interested person, likely to be affected by these draft rules has any objection(s)/suggestion(s) with regard to the proposed rules, he/she may send the written objections or suggestions to the Director Panchayati Raj, Himachal Pradesh, SDA Complex, Kasumpti, Shimla-171009, within a period of thirty days from the date of publication of the draft rules in the Rajpatra (e-Gazette) Himachal Pradesh;

The objection(s) or suggestion(s), if any, received within the period stipulated above shall be taken into consideration by the State Government before finalizing the proposed draft rules, namely:—

Draft Rules

1. Short title and commencement.—(1) These rules may be called the Himachal Pradesh Panchayati Raj (Extension to the Scheduled Areas) amendment Rules, 2026.

(2) These rules come into force from the date of publication in Rajpatra (e-gazette) Himachal Pradesh.

2. Amendment of rule 6.— For sub-rule 2 of rule 6 of the Himachal Pradesh Panchayati Raj (Extension to the Scheduled Areas) Rules, 2011, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

"No transfer of land or any interest therein by a person belonging to Scheduled Tribe shall be effected except in accordance with section 3 of Himachal Pradesh Transfer of

land (Regulation) Act, 1968, after mandatory consultation with the concerned Gram Sabha.".

By order,

Secretary (Panchayati Raj).

In the Court of Sh. Vikas Shukla, H.A.S., Marriage Officer-cum-**Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.)**

In the matter of :

1. Roop Lal aged 62 years s/o Sh. Laxman Dass, r/o Village Jangal, P.O. Jangal Beri, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

2. Neelam aged 57 years d/o Sh. Saligram, r/o Vill. Thati Rehal, P.O. Kheri, Tehsil Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.)

Versus

The General Public

Subject.— Application for the registration of marriage under section 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 (Central Act) as amended by Marriage Laws (Amendment Act 01, 49 of 2001).

Roop Lal aged 62 years s/o Sh. Laxman Dass, r/o Village Jangal, P.O. Jangal Beri, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) and Neelam aged 57 years d/o Sh. Saligram, r/o Vill. Thati Rehal, P.O. Kheri, Tehsil Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) have filed an application alongwith affidavits declarations in this court under section 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 (Central Act) as amended by the Marriage Laws (Amendment Act 01, 49 of 2001) that they have solemnized their marriage ceremony on 08-05-1990 at Vill. Thati Rehal, P.O. Kheri, Tehsil Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) as per Hindu Rites and Customs and they are living together as husband and wife since then. Hence their marriage may be registered under Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objection regarding this marriage can file the objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 18-06-2026. After that no objections will be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 23-05-2026 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal. Sd/-

Marriage Officer-cum-*Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.).*

In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.)

Neena Kumari w/o Sh. Ravi Kumar, r/o Ward No. 5 Sujanpur, P.O. Sujanpur, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) .. *Applicant.*

Versus

General Public . .*Respondent.*

Application for publication in Rajpatra (State Gazette Notification) regarding the change/correct the name of applicant as Neena instead of Neena Kumari.

Neena Kumari w/o Sh. Ravi Kumar s/o Late Sh. Ishwar Dass, r/o Ward No. 5 Sujanpur, P.O. Sujanpur, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) has submitted an application for correction of name, as per the contents of application the applicant has submitted that the correct name is Neena instead of Neena Kumari. The applicant is advised to let her name published in the Gazette of Govt. of H.P.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objections regarding this rectification in the name of applicant file the objection personally or in writing before this court on or before 20-06-2026 the objection received after 20-06-2026.

Issued today on 25-05-2026 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal. Sd/-
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

In the Court of Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.)

Meera Devi w/o Sh. Rakesh Kumar, r/o Vill. Jiar, P.O. Chauri, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) .. *Applicant.*

Versus

General Public . .*Respondent.*

Application for publication in Rajpatra (State Gazette Notification) regarding the change/correct the name of applicant as Meeran Devi instead of Meera Devi.

Meera Devi w/o Sh. Rakesh Kumar, r/o Vill. Jiar, P.O. Chauri, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) has submitted an application for correction of name, as per the contents of application the applicant has submitted that the correct name is Meeran Devi instead of Meera Devi. The applicant is advised to let her name published in the Gazette of Govt. of H.P.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objections regarding this rectification in the name of applicant file the objection personally or in writing before this court on or before 20-06-2026 the objection received after 20-06-2026.

Issued today on 25-05-2026 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal. Sd/-
Sub-Divisional Magistrate,
Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

समक्ष नायब तहसीलदार, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)

श्री राम चन्द पुत्र श्री पूर्ण चंद, महाल वरध्याड, मौजा वलडूहक, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

श्री राम चन्द पुत्र श्री पूर्ण चंद, महाल वरध्याड, मौजा वलडूहक, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0) ने दिनांक 20–05–2026 को इस कार्यालय में एक प्रार्थना–पत्र प्रस्तुत किया है जिसमें प्रार्थी ने अनुरोध किया है कि उसके पिता का नाम कागजात माल महाल वरध्याड, मौजा वलडूहक, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर में राम चन्द पुत्र इच्छया पूर्ण दर्ज है परन्तु अन्य जगह जैसे कि आधार कार्ड, परिवार नकल आदि में प्रार्थी के पिता का नाम राम चन्द पुत्र पूर्ण चंद दर्ज हैं। प्रार्थी का कहना है कि यह दोनों नाम उसके पिता के हैं। प्रार्थी अपने पिता का नाम दुरुस्ती करवाकर कागजात माल महाल वरध्याड, मौजा वलडूहक, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर में राम चन्द पुत्र श्री पूर्ण चंद करवाना चाहता है।

अतः इस इश्तहार द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त प्रार्थी के नाम को दुरुस्त करने बारे में कोई उजर एवं एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन तारीख 22–06–2026 को सुबह 10.00 बजे मुकाम तहसील कार्यालय नादौन में हाजिर अदालत होकर अपना उजर पेश कर सकता हैं। तारीख पेशी के बाद किसी किस्म का एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा तथा प्रार्थी के प्रार्थना–पत्र पर नाम दुरुस्ती बारे आवश्यक आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

यह इश्तहार मोहर अदालत व मेरे हस्ताक्षर से आज दिनांक 21–05–2026 को जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / –
नायब तहसीलदार,
तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

———————

In the Court of Sh. Vikas Shukla, H.A.S., Marriage Officer-cum-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.)

In the matter of :

1. Sunil Kumar aged 37 years s/o Sh. Piar Chand, r/o Village Chamiana, P.O. Chamiana, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.).

2. Sunaina aged 19 years d/o Sh. Uday Thakur, r/o Vill. Kala Diyara, P.O. Kala Diyara, Salimpur Patna Bihar.

Versus

The General Public

Subject.— Application for the registration of marriage under section 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 (Central Act) as amended by Marriage Laws (Amendment Act 01, 49 of 2001).

Sunil Kumar aged 37 years s/o Sh. Piar Chand, r/o Village Chamiana, P.O. Chamiana, Tehsil Sujanpur, District Hamirpur (H.P.) and Sunaina aged 19 years d/o Sh. Uday Thakur, r/o Vill.

Kala Diyara, P.O. Kala Diyara, Salimpur Patna Bihar have filed an application alongwith affidavits declarations in this court under section 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 (Central Act) as amended by the Marriage Laws (Amendment Act 01, 49 of 2001) that they have solemnized their marriage ceremony on 28-05-2025 at Vill. Kala Diyara, P.O. Kala Diyara, Salimpur Patna Bihar as per Hindu Rites and Customs and they are living together as husband and wife since then. Hence their marriage may be registered under Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objection regarding this marriage can file the objections personally or in writing before this court on or before 30-06-2026. After that no objections will be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 23-05-2026 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal. Sd/-
Marriage Officer-cum-*Sub-Divisional Magistrate,*
Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.).

In The Court of Swati Dogra, HPAS, Marriage Officer-cum-Sub Divisional Magistrate, Barsar, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.)

In the matter of:

1. Sh. Rohit Dogra s/o Sh. Ramesh Kumar, r/o Village & P.O. Loharara, Tehsil Barsar, District Hamirpur (H.P.)

2. Ms. Nidhi Patel d/o Sh. Mangal Patel, r/o Village Kath Taraon, P.O. Kathtaraon, District Mau, Uttar Pradesh (U.P.)-221 602 .. *Applicants.*

Versus

General Public

Subject:— Notice for Registration of Marriage.

Sh. Rohit Dogra and Ms. Nidhi Patel have filed an application u/s of Special Marriage Act, 1954 alongwith affidavits and supporting documents in the Court of undersigned in which they have stated that they intend to solemnize their marriage within next three months of calendar.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that if any person having any objection regarding this marriage may file his/her objections personally or in writing before this Court on or before 30-06-2026. In case no objection is received by 30-06-2026, it will be presumed that there is no objection to the registration of the above said marriage and the same will be registered accordingly.

Issued under my hand and seal of the Court on 20-05-2026.

Seal Sd/-
Marriage Officer-cum-*SDM,*
Barsar, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.).

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी एवं तहसीलदार नादौन
तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)

श्रीमती निशू वाला पुत्री धनी राम व श्रीमती सिमरो देवी, महाल कोटला, डाकघर जलाडी, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.–– प्रार्थना पत्र जेर धारा 13 (3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

श्रीमती निशू वाला पुत्री धनी राम व श्रीमती सिमरो देवी, महाल कोटला, डाकघर जलाडी, तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0) का आवेदन पत्र समस्त रिकार्ड व शपथ पत्र सहित इस कार्यालय में प्राप्त हुआ है, निशू वाला अपनी जन्म तिथि 25–03–1985 को ग्राम पंचायत कोटला चिल्लिया के रिकार्ड में दर्ज नहीं करवा सकी तथा अब वह अपनी उक्त जन्म तिथि 25–03–1985 को सम्बंधित ग्राम पंचायत कोटला चिल्लिया में दर्ज करवाना चाहती है।

अतः इस सरकारी इश्तहार गजट द्वारा आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उपरोक्त श्रीमती निशू वाला पुत्री धनी राम व श्रीमती सिमरो देवी की जन्म तिथि 25–03–1985 को ग्राम पंचायत कोटला चिल्लिया के रिकार्ड में दर्ज करने बारे कोई आपत्ति हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन दिनांक 30–06–2026 को तहसील कार्यालय नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर को प्रातः 10.00 बजे उपस्थित होकर अपना उजर पेश कर सकता हैं। आम जनता की और से कोई भी उजर या एतराज न आने की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी एवं निशू वाला की जन्म तिथि 25–03–1985 को ग्राम पंचायत कोटला चिल्लिया में दर्ज करने के आदेश नियमानुसार पारित कर दिए जायेंगे ।

यह इश्तहार मोहर अदालत व मेरे हस्ताक्षर से आज दिनांक 29–05–2026 को जारी हुआ।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी एवं तहसीलदार नादौन,
तहसील नादौन, जिला हमीरपुर (हि0प्र0)।

In the Court of Vishrut Bharati, HAS, Sub Divisional Magistrate-cum-Marriage Officer Fatehpur, Distt. Kangra (H.P.)

1. Sh. Ritik Kumar s/o Sh. Rakesh Kumar, Vill. Kutlahar, P.O. Talara, Tehsil Fatehpur, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).

2. Smt. Manisha d/o Sh. Vijay Singh, Vill. Bilwan, P.O. Dhiala, Tehsil Indora, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).

Versus

General Public

Application for the registration of marriage under Section 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 (Central Act) as amended by Marriage Law (Amendment Act 01, 49 of 2001).

Sh. Ritik Kumar s/o Sh. Rakesh Kumar, Vill. Kutlahar, P.O. Talara, Tehsil Fatehpur, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) & Smt. Manisha d/o Sh. Vijay Singh, Vill. Bilwan, P.O. Dhiala, Tehsil Indora, Distt.

Kangra (H.P.) 16 of Special Marriage Act, 1954 (Central Act) as amended by the Marriage Laws (amendment Act 01, 49 of 2001) that they have solemnized their marriage ceremony on 18-02-2026 at Radha Krishan Mandir Malikpur, Tehsil & Distt. Pathankot as per Hindu Rites and Customs and they are living together as husband and wife since then. Hence their marriage may be registered under Special Marriage Act, 1954.

Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objections regarding this marriage can file the objections personally in writing before this court on or before 12-06-2026. After that no objections will be entertained and marriage will be registered accordingly.

Issued today on 13-05-2026 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal. Sd/-
Marriage officer-cum-
Sub Divisional Magistrate,
Fatehpur Distt. Kangra (H.P.).

ब अदालत नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, तहसील लगडू, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

केस नं0 : 06 / 2023 तारीख पेशी : 23–06–2025

श्रीमती पुष्पा देवी पुत्री श्री प्रेम चंद, गांव बलाहड व डाकघर सलिहार, तहसील लगडू, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) .. वादिया।

बनाम

1. आम जनता गांव बलाहड व डाकघर सलिहार, तहसील लगडू, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)
2. प्रधान / सचिव ग्राम पंचायत सलिहार .. प्रतिवादी।

विषय.––हिमाचल प्रदेश जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1996 की धारा 13(3) के अन्तर्गत जन्म पंजीकरण बारे।

श्रीमती पुष्पा देवी पुत्री श्री प्रेम चंद, गांव बलाहड व डाकघर सलिहार ने इस अदालत में आवेदन प्रस्तुत करके अनुरोध किया है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 16–02–1962 को हुआ है, परन्तु इसका पंजीकरण पंचायत सलिहार में नहीं करवाया है। इसलिये उनके जन्म पंजीकरण का आदेश ग्राम पंचायत सलिहार को जारी किया जाए।

अतः इस कोर्ट नोटिस मुनादी के माध्यम से आम जनता व सभी प्रतिवादियों को सूचित किया जाता है कि किसी को भी इस जन्म पंजीकरण बारे कोई उजर / एतराज हो तो वह इस मामला की तयशुदा तारीख पेशी 13–06–2026 को समय 11.00 बजे सुबह इस अदालत में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर प्रस्तुत करे। गैरहाजिरी की सूरत में नियमानुसार कार्यवाई अमल में लाई जावेगी तथा इस जन्म पंजीकरण के आदेश पारित कर दिए जायेंगे।

यह इश्तहार आज दिनांक 20–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
नायब तहसीलदार एवं कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
तहसील लगडू, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

कार्यालय नायब तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, राजा का तालाब, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

केस नम्बर : 67 / एन.टी. / आर.के.टी. तारीख पेशी : 16–06–2026

उनवान मुकद्दमा : तिलक राज बनाम ठाकरी आदि।

विषय :–– मुश्त्री–मुनादी व चस्पानगी करवाये जाने सम्बन्धी।

नोटिस बनाम :

2. स्वर्ण कुमार पुत्र रतन चंद
4. केशव दत्त पुत्र रतन चंद
5. ओम दत्त पुत्र रतन चंद।

निवासी गांव दरभोली, डाकघर वडी, उप–तहसील राता का तालाब, तहसील फतेहपुर, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

उक्त मुकद्दमा में प्रतिवादी/प्रतिवादीगण उपरोक्त की तलबी के लिए इस अदालत द्वारा साधारण तरीके से कई बार इस अदालत में उपस्थित होने के लिए नोटिस जारी किए गये परन्तु साधारण तरीके से तामील न हो पा रही है। जिस कारण प्रतिवादी/प्रतिवादीगण की तामील न होने पर उक्त केस में अग्रिम कार्यवाही करने में विलम्ब हो रहा है। अतः इस नोटिस इश्तिहार के माध्यम से उपरोक्त प्रतिवादी / प्रतिवादीगण हितबद्ध व्यक्तियों को सूचित किया जाता है कि वहां वे उक्त मुकद्दमा में पैरवी हेतु दिनांक 16–06–2026 को समय 11.00 बजे सुबह असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आवे, अन्यथा हाजिर न आने की सूरत में नियमानुसार हस्ब जाबता कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 19–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
नायब तहसीलदार एवं
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
राजा का तालाब, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मुकद्दमा न0 : 814486 / 2026 किस्म मुकद्दमा–दुरुस्ती नाम तारीख पेशी : 09–06–2026

श्री कुलदीप कुमार पुत्र श्री गोरखू राम, निवासी महाल जसेहड, डा0 सुरानी, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)। ..प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता ..प्रतिवादी।

विषय.–प्रार्थना–पत्र दुरुस्ती नाम राजस्व अभलेख महाल जसेहड, अलूहा व अघार, मौजा गन्धवाड, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा हि0प्र0।

प्रार्थी श्री कुलदीप कुमार पुत्र श्री गोरखू राम, निवासी महाल जसेहड, डा0 सुरानी, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने एक प्रार्थना–पत्र मय शपथ पत्र पीठासीन अधिकारी के समक्ष प्रस्तुत करते हुए अनुरोध किया है कि उसका नाम पंचायत अभिलेख, आधार कार्ड व अन्य दस्तावेजों में कुलदीप कुमार दर्ज है

व उसका विख्यात व सही नाम भी कुलदीप कुमार ही है। परन्तु राजस्व अभिलेख पटवार वृत्त टिप के महाल जसेहड, अलूहा व अघार में उसका नाम कुलदीप चन्द गलत दर्ज हो गया है। अतः प्रार्थी अब अपने नाम की राजस्व अभिलेख महाल जसेहड, अलूहा व अघार में दुरुस्ती करवा करके कुलदीप चन्द के बजाए कुलदीप कुमार उपनाम कुलदीप चन्द दर्ज करवाना चाहता है। अतः प्रार्थी का आवेदन स्वीकार करते हुए इस मुश्त्री मुनादी चस्पांगी के माध्यम से आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उक्त प्रार्थी के नाम की राजस्व अभिलेख महाल जसेहड, अलूहा व अघार में दुरुस्ती करवा करके कुलदीप चन्द की बजाए कुलदीप कुमार उपानाम कुलदीप चन्द दर्ज करवाने बारे किसी किस्म की आपत्ति या उजर हो तो वह तारीख पेशी 09–06–2026 को असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत होकर अपना उजर पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा बाद तारीख पेशी किसी किस्म का उजर एवं एतराज नही सुना जावेगा व नाम दुरुस्ती के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

यह इश्तहार आज दिनांक 08–05–2026 को मोहर अदालत व मेरे हस्ताक्षर से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता, प्रथम श्रेणी,
खुण्डियां, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मुकद्दमा न0 : 161 / 2026 तारीख पेशी : 27–06–2026

श्री सरोज कुमार पुत्र श्री अमर सिंह, पुत्र चमारू, वासी महाल जसेहड, मौजा गन्धवाड व तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)। . .प्रार्थी।

बनाम

1. श्रीमती सत्या देवी विधवा मक्खन सिंह पुत्र श्री अमर सिंह, वासी महाल जसेहड, मौजा गन्धवाड व तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) . .प्रतिवादी।

नोटिस बनाम.–1. श्रीमती सत्या देवी विधवा मक्खन सिंह पुत्र श्री अमर सिंह, वासी महाल जसेहड, मौजा गन्धवाड व तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) . .प्रतिवादीगण।

विषय.–इन्तकाल नं0 161 वरास्त मुताबिक रजि0 बसीयतनामा महाल जसेहड, मौजा गन्धवाड के सन्दर्भ में सार्वजनिक सूचना बारे।

श्री सरोज कुमार पुत्र श्री अमर सिंह, पुत्र चमारू, वासी महाल जसेहड, मौजा गन्धवाड व तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने इस अदालत में अपने पिता श्री अमर सिंह पुत्र चमारू राम, गांव जसेहड, डा0 सुरानी, तहसील खुण्डियां का इन्तकाल मुताबिक रजिस्ट्रड बसीयत तसदीक हेतु दावा दायर कर रखा है जिसमें उपरोक्त वर्णित प्रतिवादी की तामील बार–बार इतलाह जारी करने पर भी नहीं हो पा रही है। और न ही प्रार्थी को इनका सही पता मालूम है। प्रार्थी ने इनका सही पता प्राप्त होने बारे अपनी असमर्थता जताई है। अतः न्यायालय की संतुष्टि व विश्वास हेतु यह सिद्द हो गया है कि उक्त प्रतिवादी की तामील साधारण ढंग से नहीं हो सकती है। अतः उक्त वर्णित प्रतिवादी को इस इश्तहार राजपत्र व मुश्त्री मुनादी व चस्पांगी द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि वह उक्त मुकद्दमा की पैरवी हेतु असालतन या वकालतन तारीख पेशी 27–06–2026 को हाजिर अदालत होकर पैरवी मुकद्दमा करें अन्यथा गैरहाजिरी की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाकर अगामी आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे व बाद तारीख पेशी किसी किस्म का उजर या एतराज स्वीकार न होगा।

यह इश्तहार मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से आज दिनांक 21–05–2026 जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता, द्वितीय श्रेणी,
खुण्डियां, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मुकद्दमा न0 : 709694 / 2026 किस्म मुकद्दमा–दुरुस्ती नाम तारीख पेशी : 09–06–2026

श्री ब्रहम दास पुत्र श्री किरपा, निवासी महाल चनारडी, डा0 गलोटी, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)। प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.–प्रार्थना–पत्र दुरुस्ती नाम राजस्व अभिलेख महाल चनारडी, मौजा घठियालता, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

श्री ब्रहम दास पुत्र श्री किरपा, निवासी महाल चनारडी, डा0 गलोटी, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने एक प्रार्थना–पत्र मय शपथ पत्र पीठासीन अधिकारी के समक्ष प्रस्तुत करते हुए अनुरोध किया है कि उसका नाम पंचायत अभिलेख, आधार कार्ड व अन्य दस्तावेजों में ब्रहम दास दर्ज है व उसका विख्यात व सही नाम भी ब्रहम दास ही है। परन्तु राजस्व अभिलेख पटवार वृत्त पीहडी के महाल चनारडी में उसका नाम ब्रहमू राम गलत दर्ज हो गया है। अतः प्रार्थी अब अपने नाम की राजस्व अभिलेख महाल चनारडी में दुरुस्ती करवा करके ब्रहमू राम के बजाए ब्रहम दास उपनाम ब्रहमू राम दर्ज करवाना चाहता है। अतः प्रार्थी का आवेदन स्वीकार करते हुए इस मुश्त्री मुनादी चस्पांगी के माध्यम से आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उक्त प्रार्थी के नाम की राजस्व अभिलेख महाल चनारडी में दुरुस्ती करवा करके ब्रहमू राम की बजाए ब्रहम दास उपानाम ब्रहमू राम दर्ज करवाने बारे किसी किस्म की आपत्ति या उजर हो तो वह तारीख पेशी 09–06–2026 को असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत होकर अपना उजर पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा बाद तारीख पेशी किसी किस्म का उजर एवं एतराज नहीं सुना जावेगा व नाम दुरुस्ती के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

यह इश्तहार आज दिनांक 08–05–2026 को मोहर अदालत व मेरे हस्ताक्षर से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता, प्रथम श्रेणी,
खुण्डियां, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

मुकद्दमा न0 : 709696 / 2026 किस्म मुकद्दमा–दुरुस्ती नाम तारीख पेशी : 18–06–2026

श्रीमती रीना देवी विधवा श्री काहनू राम, निवासी महाल कोहलडी, मौजा टिहरी, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)। प्रार्थिया।

बनाम

आम जनता . .प्रतिवादी।

विषय.—प्रार्थना—पत्र दुरुस्ती नाम राजस्व अभिलेख महाल कोहलडी, मौजा टिहरी, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा हि0प्र0।

श्रीमती रीना देवी विधवा श्री काहनू राम, निवासी महाल कोहलडी, मौजा टिहरी, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने एक प्रार्थना—पत्र मय शपथ पत्र पीठासीन अधिकारी के समक्ष प्रस्तुत करते हुए अनुरोध किया है कि उसके पति का नाम पंचायत अभिलेख, आधार कार्ड व अन्य दस्तावेजों में काहनू राम दर्ज है व उसके पति का विख्यात व सही नाम भी काहनू राम ही है। परन्तु राजस्व अभिलेख पटवार वृत्त टिहरी के महाल कोहलडी में उसके पति का नाम काहनू कुमार गलत दर्ज हो गया है। अतः प्रार्थिया अब अपने पति कू नाम की राजस्व अभिलेख महाल कोहलडी में दुरुस्ती करवा करके काहनू कुमार के बजाए काहनू राम उपनाम काहनू कुमार दर्ज करवाना चाहती है। अतः प्रार्थिया का आवेदन स्वीकार करते हुए इस मुश्त्री मुनादी चस्पांगी के माध्यम से आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उक्त प्रार्थिया के पति के नाम की राजस्व अभिलेख महाल कोहलडी में दुरुस्ती करवा करके काहनू कुमार की बजाए काहनू राम उपानाम काहनू कुमार दर्ज करवाने बारे किसी किस्म की आपत्ति या उजर हो तो वह तारीख पेशी 18—06—2026 को असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत होकर अपना उजर पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा बाद तारीख पेशी किसी किस्म का उजर एवं एतराज नहीं सुना जावेगा व नाम दुरुस्ती के आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

यह इश्तहार आज दिनांक 16—05—2026 को मोहर अदालत व मेरे हस्ताक्षर से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / —
सहायक समाहर्ता, प्रथम श्रेणी,
खुण्डियां, तहसील खुण्डियां, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत श्री पी0 सी0 कौण्डल तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, तहसील सुलह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

किस्म मुकद्दमा : मृत्यु पंजीकरण तारीख पेशी : 11—06—2026

निर्मला देवी पुत्री चुहडू राम, निवासी गांव सालन, डाकघर रैपुर, तहसील सुलह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) . प्रार्थिया।

बनाम

सर्वसाधारण एवं आम जनता

विषय.—प्रार्थना—पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म / मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत करने बारा।

प्रार्थिया निर्मला देवी पुत्री चुहडू राम, निवासी गांव सालन, डाकघर रैपुर, तहसील सुलह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना—पत्र मय शपथ—पत्र, ग्राम पंचायत रैपुर द्वारा जारी प्रमाण—पत्र, परिवार रजिस्टर नकल आदि दस्तावेज प्रस्तुत कर निवेदन किया है कि प्रार्थिया का जन्म गांव सालन, डा0 रैपुर में दिनांक 10—05—1956 को हुआ है। लेकिन अज्ञानतावंश ग्राम पंचायत रैपुर के पंचायत अभिलेख में जन्म पंजीकरण न हुआ है। अतः ग्राम पंचायत रैपुर के पंचायत अभिलेख में जन्म पंजीकरण करने के आदेश जारी किए जाए।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस राजपत्र इश्तहार / मुश्त्री मुनादी द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को प्रार्थिया निर्मला देवी के जन्म पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत रैपुर के पंचायत अभिलेख में दर्ज करने बारे कोई उजर व एतराज हो तो वह 11–06–2026 को प्रातः 11.00 बजे असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा प्रार्थिया निर्मला देवी पुत्री चुहडू राम के जन्म पंजीकरण दिनांक 10–05–1956 के आदेश ग्राम पंचायत रैपुर के पंचायत अभिलेख में दर्ज करने हेतु आदेश जारी कर दिए जाएंगे। उसके उपरान्त कोई भी उजर व एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा व आगामी आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 12–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
तहसीलदार एवं सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
सुलह, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत श्री रमन ठाकुर, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी, बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)

लज्या देवी पुत्री श्री नन्द लाल, निवासी गांव व डाकघर सन्साल, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थना–पत्र जेर धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

लज्या देवी पुत्री श्री नन्द लाल, निवासी गांव व डाकघर सन्साल, तहसील बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0) ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना–पत्र गुजारा है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 30–11–1945 को गांव व डाकघर सन्साल में हुआ था परन्तु इस बारे पंचायत के रिकार्ड में पंजीकरण नहीं करवाया जा सका। अतः अब पंजीकरण के आदेश दिये जायें।

अतः इस नोटिस के माध्यम से सर्वसाधारण को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उपरोक्त जन्म / मृत्यु के पंजीकरण बारे में कोई उजर / एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 23–06–2026 को सुबह 10.00 बजे असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर आकर अपना उजर / एतराज पेश कर सकता है। अन्यथा उपरोक्त जन्म / मृत्यु के पंजीकरण बारे आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे। उसके उपरान्त किसी भी प्रकार का कोई भी उजर / एतराज न सुना जायेगा।

आज दिनांक 19–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
बैजनाथ, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

**ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार, धर्मशाला,
जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)**

किस्म मुकद्दमाः तकसीम केस नं0 : 118 / 25 तारीख पेशी : 03–07–2026

"इश्तहार राजपत्र हिमाचल प्रदेश" मुस्त्री मुनादी व चस्पांगी"

Neeru Vs. Kaptan Singh & Ors

तकसीम भूमि खाता नं0 104, खतौनी नं0 133, खसरा नं0 863 / 542, कित्ता 1 कुल रकबा 000–51–05 है0 वाक्या महाल चैतडू, पटवार वृत्त चैतडू, तहसील धर्मशाला, जिला कांगड़ा हि0प्र0। जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2018–2019.

नोटिस बनाम :–

1. Kaptan Singh s/o Rajinder Dev, s/o Chand, 2. Joginder Singh s/o Late Amar Singh, s/o Parma, 3. Kushan Kumar s/o Late Amar Singh, s/o Parma, 4. Smt. Sayatri Devi w/o Late Amar Singh, s/o Parma, 5. Mahi Dass s/o Tiddu s/o Nihala, 6. Singo Ram *alias* Sidhu s/o Heera s/o Budhad, 7. Ranjeet Singh s/o Duni Chand s/o Budhad, 8. Maghi s/o Naurang, 9. Mehar Chand s/o Naurang, s/o Sudagar, 10. Jagroop Chand s/o Sukh Ram, s/o Lacchman, 11. Sanveer Chand s/o Sukh Ram, s/o Lachhman.

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा इस न्यायालय में विचाराधीन है इसमें प्रतिवादीगण को कई बार समन जारी किए गए परन्तु साधारण तरीके से तामील न हुई है, इसलिए उपरोक्त प्रतिवादीगण को इस इश्तहार अखबार, राजपत्र व चस्पांगी के द्वारा से सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी भी पक्ष को उपरोक्त वर्णित भूमि की तकसीम करने बारे कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक पेशी 03–07–2026 को अधोहस्ताक्षरी का अदालत में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर होकर अपने उजर या एतराज पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा हाजिर न आने की सूरत में उपरोक्त प्रतिवादीगण के विरुद्ध एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 05–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर।

हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील धर्मशाला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

**ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार, धर्मशाला,
जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)**

किस्म मुकद्दमाः तकसीम केस नं0 : 117 / 25 तारीख पेशी : 03–07–2026

"इश्तहार राजपत्र हिमाचल प्रदेश" मुस्त्री मुनादी व चस्पांगी"

Neeru Vs. Baldev Singh & Ors

तकसीम भूमि खाता नं0 3, खतौनी नं0 3, खसरा नं0 82, 90, 103, 105, 107, 109, 132, 138 कित्ता 8, कुल रकबा 01–37–57 है0 वाक्या महाल बाहल, पटवार वृत्त चैतडू, तहसील धर्मशाला, जिला कांगड़ा हि0प्र0। जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2022–2023.

नोटिस बनाम :–

1. Baldev Singh s/o Partap Chand s/o Salig Ram, 2. Sanjeev Singh s/o Balbir Singh, 3. Kashmir Singh s/o Balbir Singh, 4. Kumari Sapna Devi d/o Balbir Singh, 5. Shakuntala Devi w/o Balbir Singh, 6. Tulsi Ram s/o Jaswant Singh, 7. Ishwar Singh s/o Tulsi Ram, 8. Onkar Singh s/o Tulsi Ram, 9. Kashmir Singh @ Shamsher Singh s/o Tulsi Ram, 10. Pushpa Devi d/o Tulsi Ram, 11. Kanta Devi d/o Tulsi Ram, 12. Rajender Singh s/o Jagdish Chand,

13. Rakesh Kumar s/o Jagdish Chand, 14. Pitamber Singh s/o Jagdish Chand, 15. Shresthta Devi d/o Jagdish Chand, 16. Seema Devi d/o Jagdish Chand, 17. Seema Devi w/o Late Rajesh Kumar, 18. Mehtab Singh s/o Tulsi Ram, 19. Sharda Devi d/o Geeta Devi d/o Tusli Ram, 20. Rajeev Kumar s/o Kuldeep Singh, 21. Barjeaswar Singh s/o Kuldeep Singh, 22. Balbhadra Singh s/o Raghubir Singh, 23. Krishan Singh s/o Raghubir Singh, 24. Ram Singh s/o Raghubir Singh, 25. Kuldeep Singh s/o Uttam Singh, 26. Smt. Kamlesh Kumari d/o Uttam Singh, 27. Smt. Sudesh Kumari d/o Uttam Singh, 28. Surender Kumar s/o Rattan chand, 29. Suresh Kumar s/o Rattan chand, 30. Savinder Kumar Rattan chand, 31. Devender Singh s/o Rattan chand, 32. Smt. Pushpindera d/o Rattan chand, 33. Smt. Vanita d/o Rattan chand, 34. Baldev Singh s/o Haria, 35. Shashupal s/o Haria, 36. Satish Kumar s/o Haria, 37. Akshay Kumar s/o Ashwani Kumar, 38. Vishwanath Singh s/o Sukhdev Singh, 39. Tavish s/o Vishwanath Singh, 40. Sunil Kumar s/o Ami Chand, 41. Parveen Thakur s/o Ami Chand, 42. Shubnam Katoch d/o Ami Chand, 43. Sunita Rana d/o Ami Chand, 44. Anita Rana d/o Ami Chand.

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा इस न्यायालय में विचाराधीन है इसमें प्रतिवादीगण को कई बार समन जारी किए गए परन्तु साधारण तरीके से तामील न हुई है, इसलिए उपरोक्त प्रतिवादीगण को इस इश्तहार अखबार, राजपत्र व चस्पांगी के द्वारा से सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी भी पक्ष को उपरोक्त वर्णित भूमि की तकसीम करने बारे कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक पेशी 03–07–2026 को अधोहस्ताक्षरी का अदालत में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर होकर अपने उजर या एतराज पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा हाजिर न आने की सूरत में उपरोक्त प्रतिवादीगण के विरुद्ध एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 05–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील धर्मशाला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

**ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी एवं तहसीलदार, धर्मशाला,
जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)**

किस्म मुकद्दमाः तकसीम केस नं0 : 119 / 25 तारीख पेशी : 03–07–2026

"इश्तहार राजपत्र हिमाचल प्रदेश" मुस्त्री मुनादी व चस्पांगी"

Neeru Vs. Shakti Chand & Ors

तकसीम भूमि खाता नं0 13 खतौनी नं0 20, खसरा नं0 104, 272 / 120, 273 / 120 कित्ता 3, कुल रकबा 0–56–90 है0 वाक्या महाल बाहल, पटवार वृत्त चैतडू, तहसील धर्मशाला, जिला कांगडा हि0प्र0। जमाबन्दी वर्ष 2022–2023.

नोटिस बनाम :–

1. Shakti Chand s/o Sidhu, 2. Kaptan Singh s/o Sidhu, 3. Ami Chand s/o Sidhu, 4. Sunil Kumar s/o Ami Chand, 5. Praveen Thakur s/o Ami Chand, S/o Sidhu, 6. Shabnam Katoch d/o Ami Chand, s/o Sidhu, 7. Sunita Rana d/o Ami Chand s/o Sidhu, 8. Anita Rana d/o Ami Chand s/o Sidhu.

उपरोक्त मुकद्दमा इस न्यायालय में विचाराधीन है इसमें प्रतिवादीगण को कई बार समन जारी किए गए परन्तु साधारण तरीके से तामील न हुई है, इसलिए उपरोक्त प्रतिवादीगण को इस इश्तहार अखबार, राजपत्र व

चस्पांगी के द्वारा से सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी भी पक्ष को उपरोक्त वर्णित भूमि की तकसीम करने बारे कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक पेशी 03–07–2026 को अधोहस्ताक्षरी की अदालत में असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर होकर अपने उजर या एतराज पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा हाजिर न आने की सूरत में उपरोक्त प्रतिवादीगण के विरुद्ध एक तरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 05–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
तहसील धर्मशाला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

In the Court of Assistant Collector 1st Grade and Executive Magistrate, Dharamshala, District Kangra, Himachal Pradesh

मुकद्दमा नं0: जन्म पंजीकरण

Mr./Mrs./Ms. Kamlesh Kumari d/o Late Sita Ram, r/o Village and Post Office Sarah, Tehsil Dharamshala, District Kangra (H.P.)

बनाम

आम जनता

1. The General Public.
2. The Registrar Birth & Deaths, C.M.O. Kangra at Dharamshala.
3. The Commissioner Municipal Corporation Dharamshala.
4. The Registrar, (Birth & Deaths)-*cum*-Panchayat Secretary Concerned G.P.

विषय.––प्रार्थना–पत्र जेरे धारा 13(3) हिमाचल प्रदेश जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969.

Mr./Mrs./Ms. Kamlesh Kumari d/o Late Sita Ram, r/o Village and Post Office Sarah, Tehsil Dharamshala, District Kangra (H.P.) ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना–पत्र सहित मुकद्दमा दायर किया है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 21–02–1977 को गांव सराह, डाकघर सराह, तहसील धर्मशाला में हुआ था, परन्तु एम0 सी0 धर्मशाला / संबंधित ग्राम पंचायत में जन्म / मृत्यु रजिस्टर में पंजीकृत न है। अतः इसे पंजीकृत किये जाने के आदेश दिये जायें। इस नोटिस इश्तहार मुस्त्री मुनादी के द्वारा समस्त जनता को तथा सम्बन्धित सम्बन्धियों को सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी को Kamlesh Kumari d/o Late Sita Ram की जन्म तिथि 21–02–1977 पंजीकृत किये जाने बारे कोई एतराज हो तो वह अपना एतराज इस अदालत में दिनांक 23–06–2026 को असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर होकर पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा मुताबिक शपथ–पत्र जन्म तिथि पंजीकृत किये जाने बारे आदेश पारित कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 24–04–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत द्वारा जारी किया गया।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
धर्मशाला, जिला कांगड़ा (हि0प्र0)।

————————

Before the Court of Assistant Collector 1st Grade-cum **Executive Magistrate Dharamshala Distt. Kangra (H.P.)**

Whereas, an application has been instituted before this Hon'ble Court/Authority regarding declaration of missing person namely Sh. Ramesh Kumar s/o Roshan Lal r/o Village and Post Office Khaniyara, Tehsil Dharamshala, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) who as alleged has not been seen or heard of for a period exceeding 29-30 years by those persons who would naturally have heard of him if he had been alive; as per 8.47 of the record of rights contained in chapter 8 of the land record manual.

And whereas, it has been repersented that despite due dilingence, inquiry and efforts made by the applicant/petitioner, the whereasbouts, of the aforesaid person could not be ascertained and no communication whatsoever has been recevied from him/her during the aforesaid period.

Now, therefore, notice is hereby issued to the aforesaid missing person, if alive and also to the general public at large calling upon any person having any information, objection, claim or interest contrary to the averments made in the petiton/application, to appear before this Hon'ble Court/Authority either personally or through duly authorized counsel and file objections, if any alongwith supporting documents/evidence within 30 days from the date of publication of this notice.

Take notice that in case no objection or information is received within the stipulated period appropriate proceedings/orders shall be passed *ex parte* in accordance with law on the basis of material available on record.

Given under my hand and seal of this Court/Authority on this 19th day of May, 2026.

Seal. Sd/-

Assistant Collector 1st Grade,
Dharamshala, District Kangra (H.P.).

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी एवं नायब तहसीलदार कुल्लू, तहसील व जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)

श्रीमती निर्मला देवी पुत्री श्री अर्जुन सिंह, निवासी गांधी नगर, डाकघर ढालपुर, तहसील व जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

अदालती इश्तहार / नोटिस

प्रार्थिया श्रीमती निर्मला देवी पुत्री श्री अर्जुन सिंह, निवासी गांधी नगर, डाकघर ढालपुर, तहसील व जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) ने अधीन धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अंतर्गत एक आवेदन जिला रजिस्ट्रार (जन्म एवं मृत्यु) / मुख्य चिकित्सा अधिकारी, जिला कुल्लू के पत्र क्रमांक HFW-KLU (Delayed Birth & Death)-KLU 2025–13621, दिनांक 25 अप्रैल, 2026 अनुलग्न क्रमशः अपना ब्यान हल्फी, आधार कार्ड, दो गवाहन के ब्यान हल्फी अनुपलब्धता प्रमाण–पत्र, रिपोर्ट नगर परिषद् कुल्लू अन्य कागजात

सहित इस अदालत में प्राप्त हुआ है जिसमें प्रार्थिया ने आवेदन किया है कि इनका जन्म दिनांक 08–03–1969 को हुआ है, अब वह अपने जन्म की प्रविष्टि उक्त नगर परिषद् कुल्लू तहसील व जिला कुल्लू हि0प्र0 मे दर्ज करवाना चाहती है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इश्तहार / नोटिस द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस संबंध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उजर या एतराज हो तो वह स्वयं अथवा अपने प्रतिनिधि द्वारा दिनांक 22–06–2026 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालत में हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। अगर उक्त तारीख तक किसी का उजर या एतराज प्राप्त नहीं होता तो श्रीमती निर्मला देवी पुत्री श्री अर्जुन सिंह, निवासी गांधी नगर, डाकघर ढालपुर, तहसील व जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) में दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जाएंगे ।

आज दिनांक 21–05–2026 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी एवं नायब तहसीलदार कुल्लू,
तहसील व जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)।

———————

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी एवं नायब तहसीलदार कुल्लू, तहसील व जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)

श्रीमती जमना देवी पुत्री श्री मोती राम, निवासी सतरिम, डाकघर भल्यानी, तहसील व जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

अदालती इश्तहार / नोटिस

प्रार्थिया श्रीमती जमना देवी पुत्री श्री मोती राम, निवासी सतरिम, डाकघर भल्यानी, तहसील व जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) ने अधीन धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अंतर्गत एक आवेदन जिला रजिस्ट्रार (जन्म एवं मृत्यु) / मुख्य चिकित्सा अधिकारी, जिला कुल्लू के पत्र क्रमांक HFW-KLU (Delayed Birth & Death)-KLU 2026–3961, दिनांक 28 फरवरी, 2026 अनुलग्न क्रमशः अपना ब्यान हल्फी, आधार कार्ड, दो गवाहन के ब्यान हल्फी, अनुपलब्धता प्रमाण–पत्र, रिपोर्ट ग्राम पंचायत भूमतीर अन्य कागजात सहित इस अदालत में प्राप्त हुआ है जिसमें प्रार्थिया ने आवेदन किया है कि उसका जन्म दिनांक 01–01–1985 को हुआ है, अब वह अपने जन्म की प्रविष्टि उक्त ग्राम पंचायत भूमतीर, तहसील व जिला कुल्लू हि0प्र0 में दर्ज करवाना चाहती है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इश्तहार / नोटिस द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस संबंध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उजर या एतराज हो तो वह स्वयं अथवा अपने प्रतिनिधि द्वारा दिनांक 22–06–2026 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालत में हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। अगर उक्त तारीख तक किसी का उजर या एतराज प्राप्त नहीं होता तो श्रीमती जमना देवी पुत्री श्री मोती राम, निवासी सतरिम, डाकघर भल्यानी, तहसील व जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) में दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जाएंगे ।

आज दिनांक 21–05–2026 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी एवं नायब तहसीलदार कुल्लू,
तहसील व जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी एवं नायब तहसीलदार कुल्लू, तहसील व जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)

श्रीमती पार्वती देवी पुत्री श्री बर्यागी राम, निवासी कडोंन, डाकघर भूठी, तहसील व जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

अदालती इश्तहार / नोटिस

प्रार्थिया श्रीमती पार्वती देवी पुत्री श्री बर्यागी राम, निवासी कडोंन, डाकघर भूठी, तहसील व जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) ने अधीन धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अंतर्गत एक आवेदन जिला रजिस्ट्रार (जन्म एवं मृत्यु) / मुख्य चिकित्सा अधिकारी, जिला कुल्लू के पत्र क्रमांक HFW-KLU (Delayed Birth & Death)-KLU 2026–4330, दिनांक 07 मार्च, 2026 अनुलग्न क्रमशः अपना ब्यान हल्फी, आधार कार्ड, दो गवाहन के ब्यान हल्फी, अनुपलब्धता प्रमाण–पत्र, रिपोर्ट ग्राम पंचायत चोपारसा अन्य कागजात सहित इस अदालत में प्राप्त हुआ है जिसमें प्रार्थिया ने आवेदन किया है कि इनका जन्म दिनांक 10–09–1975 को हुआ है, अब वह अपने जन्म की प्रविष्टि उक्त ग्राम पंचायत चोपारसा तहसील व जिला कुल्लू हि0प्र0 मे दर्ज करवाना चाहती है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इश्तहार / नोटिस द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस संबंध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को उजर या एतराज हो तो वह स्वयं अथवा अपने प्रतिनिधि द्वारा दिनांक 22–06–2026 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालत में हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। अगर उक्त तारीख तक किसी का उजर या एतराज प्राप्त नहीं होता तो श्रीमती पार्वती देवी पुत्री श्री बर्यागी राम, निवासी कडोंन, डाकघर भूठी, तहसील व जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0) में दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जाएंगे ।

आज दिनांक 21–05–2026 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी एवं नायब तहसीलदार कुल्लू,
तहसील व जिला कुल्लू (हि0प्र0)।

————————

In the Court of Sh. Aditya Guleria, Executive Magistrate, Sundernagar, Distt. Mandi (H.P.)

In the matter of :

Smt. Meera Devi d/o Sh. Chottu Ram, r/o Village Malhog, P.O. Harabag, Tehsil Sundernagar, Distt. Mandi (H.P.) . . *Applicant.*

Versus

General Public . . *Respondents*

Subject .—*Registration of delayed birth of the applicant.*

Whereas, an application has been received from Smt. Meera Devi d/o Sh. Chottu Ram, r/o Village Malhog, P.O. Harabag, Tehsil Sundernagar, Distt. Mandi, H.P. seeking registration of her

delayed birth event, stated to have been born on 16-04-1981 at Village Malhog, P.O. Harabag, Tehsil Sundernagar, which could not be entered/registered in the record of Gram Panchayat Sundernagar within the prescribed period under the registration of Births and Deaths Act, 1969.

And whereas, the said applicant has prayed for registration of said birth at this belated stage;

Now, therefore, notice is hereby given to the general public that if any person has any objection or information regarding the facts stated in the said application he/she may submit the same in writing alongwith supporting evidence, if any to the undersigned on or before 22-06-2026.

In case no objection is received within the stipulated period, it shall be presumed that no one has any objection and the matter shall be proceeded further as per law.

Issued under my hand and seal in this day of 22nd of May, 2026.

Seal. Sd/-
Executive Magistrate,
Sundernagar, Distt. Mandi (H.P.).

ब अदालत श्री अंकित शर्मा, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी (हि0प्र0)

उनवान मुकद्दमा :

श्री दीपक कुमार पुत्र श्री तुलसी राम, निवासी गांव नालनी, डाकघर मलोह, तहसील सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी (हि0प्र0) .. प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता .. प्रत्यार्थीगण।

प्रार्थना–पत्र बराये कागजात माल में प्रार्थी के नाम को दुरुस्त करने बारे।

श्री दीपक कुमार पुत्र श्री तुलसी राम, निवासी गांव नालनी, डाकघर मलोह, तहसील सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी (हि0प्र0) ने इस न्यायालय में प्रार्थना–पत्र गुजारा है कि प्रार्थी का नाम आधार कार्ड, परिवार रजिस्टर, आदि दस्तावेजों में दीपक कुमार है। परन्तु राजस्व अभिलेख पटवार वृत्त मलोह के मुहाल नालनी में दीप कुमार दर्ज है। प्रार्थी उपरोक्त राजस्व अभिलेख पटवार वृत्त मलोह के मुहाल नालनी में दीप कुमार के स्थान पर दीप कुमार उपनाम दीपक कुमार करवाना चाहता है।

अतः इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त नाम दुरुस्ती के बारे में कोई भी उजर / एतराज हो तो दिनांक 15–06–2026 को सुबह 10.00 बजे असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपना उजर / एतराज पेश कर सकता है। उपरोक्त तिथि के पश्चात् किसी भी व्यक्ति का कोई एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा व नाम दुरुस्ती के बारे में हस्ब जाबता कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 21–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत श्री अंकित शर्मा, सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी, सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी (हि0प्र0)

उनवान मुकद्दमा :

श्री राम चन्द्र उपनाम रामचंदर जोगी राम चौहान पुत्र श्री जोगी राम, निवासी गांव घांगल, डाकघर महादेव, तहसील सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी (हि0प्र0) .. प्रार्थी।

बनाम

आम जनता .. प्रत्यार्थीगण।

प्रार्थना–पत्र बराये कागजात माल में प्रार्थी के नाम को दुरुस्त करने बारे।

श्री राम चन्द्र उपनाम रामचंदर जोगी राम चौहान पुत्र श्री जोगी राम, निवासी गांव घांगल, डाकघर महादेव, तहसील सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी (हि0प्र0) ने इस न्यायालय में प्रार्थना–पत्र गुजारा है कि प्रार्थी का नाम आधार कार्ड में रामचंदर जोगी राम चौहान है। परन्तु राजस्व अभिलेख पटवार वृत्त महादेव के मुहाल घांगल में राम चन्द्र दर्ज है। प्रार्थी उपरोक्त राजस्व अभिलेख पटवार वृत्त महादेव के मुहाल घांगल में राम चन्द्र के स्थान पर राम चन्द्र उपनाम रामचंदर जोगी राम चौहान करवाना चाहता है।

अतः इस इश्तहार के माध्यम से आम जनता को सूचित किया जाता है कि उक्त नाम दुरुस्ती के बारे में कोई भी उजर / एतराज हो तो दिनांक 10–06–2026 को सुबह 10.00 बजे असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपना उजर / एतराज पेश कर सकता है। उपरोक्त तिथि के पश्चात् किसी भी व्यक्ति का कोई एतराज काबिले समायत न होगा व नाम दुरुस्ती के बारे में हस्ब जाबता कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 21–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर सहित अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता प्रथम श्रेणी,
सुन्दरनगर, जिला मण्डी (हि0प्र0)।

––––––––––

ब अदालत श्री प्रेम सिंह, कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी सराहन, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)

नं0 मुकद्दमा : 7 / 2026 तारीख दायर : 4–5–2026 अगली सुनवाई : 9–6–2026

श्रीमती मीना देवी पुत्री श्री यज्ञा दत, गांव डवरच, डाकघर शाहधार, उप–तहसील सराहन, हालाबाद पत्नी रमेश शर्मा, निवासी गांव सनारसा, डा0 करतोट, तहसील रामपुर, जिला शिमला, हि0प्र0 .. वादी।

बनाम

आम जनता .. प्रतिवादी।

विषय.––प्रार्थना–पत्र बाबत ग्राम पंचायत सराहन में जन्म तिथि पंजीकरण बारे।

श्रीमती मीना देवी पुत्री श्री यज्ञा दत, गांव डवरच, डाकघर शाहधार, उप–तहसील सराहन, हालाबाद पत्नी रमेश शर्मा, निवासी गांव सनारसा, डा0 करतोट, तहसील रामपुर, जिला शिमला, हि0प्र0 ने इस कार्यालय में अपनी जन्म तिथि का पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत सराहन में दर्ज करवाने बारे आवेदन–पत्र व ब्यान हल्फी दिया है। प्रार्थिया ने आवेदन किया है कि उसकी अपनी जन्म तिथि का पंजीकरण पंचायत अभिलेख सराहन में दर्ज न हो सका। प्रार्थिया का नाम व जन्म तिथि निम्न हैः––

क्रम सं0	प्रार्थिया का नाम	तारीख जन्म
1.	श्रीमती मीना देवी पुत्री श्री यज्ञा दत	19–09–1967

अतः आम जनता को इस इश्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि ग्राम पंचायत अभिलेख में प्रार्थिया की जन्म तिथि का पंजीकरण करने बारे किसी भी व्यक्ति को किसी भी प्रकार का उजर व एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 09–06–2026 को प्रातः 11.00 बजे असालतन या वकालतन हाजिर अदालत आकर अपना उजर व एतराज पेश कर सकता है अन्यथा एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जावेगी।

आज दिनांक 16–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
(प्रेम सिंह),
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी,
सराहन, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

————

ब अदालत उप–मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, चौपाल, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)

1. श्री वरुण डोगरा पुत्र श्री मोहन डोगरा, ग्राम व डाकघर भरानु, तहसील नेरवा, जिला शिमला, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

1. ग्राम पंचायत भरानु नेरवा।
2. आम जनता।

Application for registration of marriage under the Himachal Pradesh marriage Act, 1996.

नोटिस :

आम जनता को इस नोटिस के द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि श्री वरुण डोगरा पुत्र श्री मोहन डोगरा, ग्राम व डाकघर भरानु, तहसील नेरवा, जिला शिमला, हि0प्र0 ने उपायुक्त महोदय शिमला के माध्यम से इस अदालत में एक प्रार्थना–पत्र दायर किया है कि उनका विवाह श्रीमती पूनम देवी पुत्री श्री अशोक कुमार, गांव सलासी, डाकघर घुमारवीं, तहसील झंडूता, जिला बिलासपुर, हि0प्र0 के साथ स्थान गांव सलासी, डाकघर घुमारवीं, तहसील झंडूता, जिला बिलासपुर, हि0प्र0 में दिनांक 18–04–2024 को संपन्न हुआ। किन्तु वरुण डोगरा व पूनम देवी का विवाह पंजीकरण ग्राम पंचायत भरानू में निर्धारित समय पर नहीं किया गया। प्रार्थी अपना विवाह ग्राम पंचायत भरानू में पंजीकृत करवाना चाहता है। जिसकी पुष्टि हेतु प्रार्थना–पत्र के साथ नकल परिवार रजिस्टर व शपथ पत्र की छायाप्रति संलग्न की है।

अतः आम जनता को इस नोटिस के द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी आम व खास को परिवार रजिस्टर ग्राम पंचायत भरानू में विवाह पंजीकृत करने में कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 22–06–2026 को या इससे पूर्व इस अदालत में असालतन या वकालतन जैसी भी सूरत हो हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज पेश करें। दीगर सूरत में वरुण डोगरा पुत्र श्री मोहन डोगरा का विवाह पूनम देवी पुत्री अशोक कुमार का विवाह पंजीकृत करने हेतू आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 22–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
उप–मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
चौपाल, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

ब अदालत उप–मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी, चौपाल, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)

1. श्री ईशांत झगटा पुत्र श्री संतोष झगटा, ग्राम व डाकघर नेरवा, तहसील नेरवा, जिला शिमला, हि0प्र0।

बनाम

1. नगर पंचायत नेरवा।
2. आम जनता।

Application for registration of marriage under the Himachal Pradesh marriage Act, 1996.

नोटिस :

आम जनता को इस नोटिस के द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि श्री ईशांत झगटा पुत्र श्री संतोष झगटा, ग्राम व डाकघर नेरवा, तहसील नेरवा, जिला शिमला, हि0प्र0 ने इस अदालत में प्रार्थना–पत्र दायर किया है कि उनका विवाह श्रीमती आरुशी तोमर पुत्री श्री मीखन सिंह तोमर, गांव निवासी एन0 एच0 11, ग्राम घिगोऊ, डाकघर व तहसील मटीयावा, जिला देहरादून, उतराखंड के साथ दिनांक 02–10–2025 को संपन्न हुआ किन्तु ईशांत झगटा व आरुशी तोमर का विवाह पंजीकरण नगर पंचायत नेरवा में निर्धारित समय पर नहीं किया गया। प्रार्थी अपना विवाह नगर पंचायत नेरवा में पंजीकृत करवाना चाहता है जिसकी पुष्टि हेतु प्रार्थना–पत्र के साथ नकल परिवार रजिस्टर व शपथ पत्र की छायाप्रति संलग्न की है।

अतः आम जनता को इस नोटिस के द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी आम व खास को परिवार रजिस्टर नगर पंचायत नेरवा में विवाह पंजीकृत करने में कोई एतराज हो तो वह दिनांक 22–06–2026 को या इससे पूर्व इस अदालत में असालतन या वकालतन जैसी भी सूरत हो हाजिर आकर अपना एतराज पेश करें। दीगर सूरत में ईशांत झगटा पुत्र श्री संतोष झगटा व आरुशी तोमर पुत्री श्री मीखन सिंह तोमर का विवाह पंजीकृत करने हेतु आदेश पारित कर दिए जाएंगे।

आज दिनांक 22–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी किया गया।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
उप–मण्डल दण्डाधिकारी,
चौपाल, जिला शिमला (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी, नारग, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)

दावा सं0 : 802326 ऑफ 2026 तारीख मजरुआ : 19–02–2026

श्री सुभाष चन्द पुत्र श्री ज्ञान दत, निवासी गांव मलहाडा लखोट, डा0 कुज्जी, उप–तहसील नारग, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

बनाम

आम जनता

विषय.––प्रार्थना–पत्र अधीन धारा 35 ता 38 हि0 प्र0 भू–राजस्व अधिनियम, 1953.

श्री सुभाष चन्द पुत्र श्री ज्ञान दत, निवासी गांव मलहाडा लखोट, डा0 कुज्जी, उप–तहसील नारग, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने इस अदालत में धारा 35 ता 38 के अन्तर्गत अपने पिता का नाम ज्ञान दत दुरुस्ती

करने हेतु आवेदन–पत्र गुजार रखा है कि प्रार्थी के पिता का नाम ज्ञान दत है, परन्तु राजस्व अभिलेख मौजा उप–सम्पदा मलहाडा लखोट, उप–तहसील नारग में ज्ञान चन्द दर्ज है। अब प्रार्थी अपने पिता का नाम राजस्व अभिलेख मौजा उप–सम्पदा मलहाडा लखोट, उप–तहसील नारग में दुरुस्त करवाकर ज्ञान चन्द के स्थान पर ज्ञान दत दर्ज करवाना चाहता है।

अतः आम जनता को इस इश्तहार द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि यदि किसी व्यक्ति आम या खास को प्रार्थी के पिता का नाम ज्ञान दत राजस्व अभिलेख मौजा उप–सम्पदा मलहाडा लखोट में ज्ञान चन्द के स्थान पर ज्ञान दत दर्ज करने बारे किसी प्रकार का उजर एवं एतराज हो तो वह असालतन या वकालतन दिनांक 19–06–2026 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे तक अपना उजर एवं एतराज न्यायालय में पेश कर सकते हैं। गैरहाजिरी की सूरत में एकतरफा कार्यवाही अमल में लाई जाएगी।

आज दिनांक 19–05–2026 को मेरे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
सहायक समाहर्ता द्वितीय श्रेणी,
नारग, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0)।

————————

ब अदालत कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी (नायब–तहसीलदार), नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0 प्र0)

श्रुति शर्मा पुत्री श्री ओम दत्त शर्मा, निवासी गांव सरोगा टिक्कर व डा0 चाकली, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) (Address of Place of Birth-MIG 31, HB Coloney Nahan, P.O. & Tehsil Nahan, Distt. Sirmaur, H.P.).

बनाम

आम जनता

प्रार्थिया श्रुति शर्मा पुत्री श्री ओम दत्त शर्मा, निवासी गांव सरोगा टिक्कर व डा0 चाकली, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) ने अधीन धारा 13(3) जन्म एवं मृत्यु पंजीकरण अधिनियम, 1969 के अन्तर्गत एक आवेदन जिला रजिस्ट्रार (जन्म एवं मृत्यु) / मुख्य चिकित्सा अधिकारी, जिला सिरमौर स्थित नाहन के पत्र क्रमांक HFW-N/ST/B&D/Delayed Cases/2026-195, दिनांक 08–04–2026 अनुलग्न क्रमशः अपना ब्यान हल्फी, आधार कार्ड, दो गवाहन के ब्यान हल्फी, अनुपलब्धता प्रमाण–पत्र रजिस्ट्रार जन्म व मृत्यु नगरपालिका परिषद, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0), प्रति परिवार रजिस्ट्रर, प्रति हिमाचल प्रमाण–पत्र, प्रति दसवीं प्रमाण–पत्र एवं अन्य कागजात सहित मामले में पूर्ण छानबीन उपरान्त इस अदालत में प्राप्त हुआ है। जिसमें प्रार्थिया ने आवेदन किया है कि उसकी जन्म तिथि 16–12–2000 है, जिसे वह एवं उसका परिवार अज्ञानतावश नगरपालिका नाहन, तहसील नाहन में दर्ज न करवा सके। अब वह अपनी जन्म तिथि उक्त नगरपालिका नाहन, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) में दर्ज करवाना चाहती है।

अतः सर्वसाधारण को इस इश्तहार / नोटिस द्वारा सूचित किया जाता है कि इस सम्बन्ध में यदि किसी व्यक्ति को कोई उजर या एतराज हो तो वह स्वयं अथवा अपने प्रतिनिधि द्वारा दिनांक 22–06–2026 को प्रातः 10.00 बजे अदालत में हाजिर होकर अपना एतराज प्रस्तुत कर सकता है। अगर उक्त तारीख तक किसी का उजर / एतराज प्राप्त नहीं होता तो श्रुति शर्मा पुत्री श्री ओम दत्त एवं श्रीमती वीना देवी की जन्म तिथि 16–12–2000, नगरपालिका नाहन, तहसील नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0प्र0) में दर्ज करने के आदेश जारी कर दिये जायेंगे।

आज दिनांक 22–05–2026 को हमारे हस्ताक्षर व मोहर अदालत से जारी हुआ।

मोहर। हस्ताक्षरित / –
कार्यकारी दण्डाधिकारी (नयाब–तहसीलदार),
नाहन, जिला सिरमौर (हि0 प्र0)।

Before Sh. Ravinder Singh Sisodia, Executive Magistrate-cum**-(Naib-Tehsildar), Majra, District Sirmaur (H.P.)**

Case No.	Date of Institution	Date of Decision
19/2026	15-05-2026	Pending for 22-06-2026

Sh. Gaurav Sharma son of Late Sh. Ram Gopal Sharma, r/o Village Tokion, P.O. Sainwala Mubarikpur, Sub-Tehsil Majra, District Sirmaur (H.P.) ..*Applicant.*

Versus

General Public ..*Respondents.*

Application Under Section 13(3) of Birth And Death Registration Act, 1969.

Sh. Gaurav Sharma son of Late Sh. Ram Gopal Sharma, r/o Village Tokion, P.O. Sainwala Mubarikpur, Sub-Tehsil Majra, District Sirmaur (H.P.) has moved an application before the undersigned under section 13(3) of Birth and Death Registration Act, 1969 alongwith affidavits and other documents stating therein that his mother namely Bimla Devi died on 14-09-2013 at Village Tokion, P.O. Sainwala Mubarikpur, District Sirmaur (H.P.) but her date of death could not be registered in the records of Gram Panchayat Sainwala Mubarikpur, Sub-Tehsil Majra, District Sirmaur (H.P.) within stipulated period. Hence he prayed for passing necessary orders to the Secretary, Births & Deaths Registration, Gram Panchayat Sainwala Mubarikpur, Sub-Tehsil Majra for entering the same in the births and deaths records.

Therefore, by this proclamation the general public is hereby informed that any person having any objection for the registration of delayed date of death of Bimla Devi wife of Sh. Ram Gopal, may submit their objections in writing in this court on or before 22-06-2026 at 10.00 A.M., failing which no objection will be entertained after expiry of date.

Given under my hand and seal of the court on this 21st day of May, 2026.

Seal. Sd/-
(RAVINDER SINGH SISODIA),
Executive Magistrate (Naib Tehsildar),
Majra, District Sirmaur (H.P.).

In the Court of Dr. Poonam, HPAS, Marriage Officer-cum**-Sub Divisional Magistrate, Solan, Tehsil & District Solan (H.P.)**

NOTICE UNDER SECTION 16 OF SPECIAL MARRIAGE ACT

Whereas, Mr. Dilip Shankar son of Mr. Ram Kishore, resident of House No. 108, Gurudwara Mohalla, Subathu Chawno, P.O. Subathu, Tehsil and District Solan (H.P.) and Mrs. Kavita d/o Mr. Ram Gulam and wife of Mr. Dilip Shankar, presently residing at House No. 108, Gurudwara Mohalla, Subathu Chawno, P.O. Subathu, Tehsil and District Solan (H.P.) have filed application for the registration of their marriage, which was solemnized on 15-03-2020 and they have been living as husband and wife ever since then.

And whereas, both applicants have submitted in their application and in their affidavits that Mr. Dilip Shankar and Mrs. Kavita were unmarried at the time of solemnization of their marriage and were major in age and having no prohibited relations to each other, debarring them to marry each other. Both the applicants have requested for registration of their marriage.

Notices have been served to all concerned and General Public to this effect that if anybody has got any objection regarding the registration of marriage duly solemnized between the above parties *i.e.* Mr. Dilip Shankar and Mrs. Kavita they may file their written objections and appear personally or through their authorized agents before me within a period of thirty days from the date of issuance of this notice. After expiry of the said period, the marriage certificate would be issued to the applicants by this court post which no objection will be heard or accepted.

Issued under my hand and seal of the court on this 20th day of May, 2026.

Seal. Sd/-

Dr. POONAM, HPAS,
Marriage Officer-cum- *Sub-Divisional Magistrate,*
Solan, District Solan (H.P.).

In the Court of Marriage Officer-cum**-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Bangana, District Una, Himachal Pradesh**

In the matter of :

1. Sh. Anil Kumar s/o Sh. Rattan Chand, r/o Village Harsa Jandora, P.O. Bhaloun, Tehsil Bangana, District Una (H.P.).

2. Ms. Shivani d/o Sh. Sadh Mohammad, r/o Village Akrot, P.O. Thathal, Tehsil Amb, District Una (H.P.) . . *Applicants.*

Versus

General Public

Subject.—Application for the registration of Marriage under section 8(4) of Himachal Pradesh marriage rules (H.P.).

Sh. Anil Kumar s/o Sh. Rattan Chand, r/o Village Harsa Jandora, P.O. Bhaloun, Tehsil Bangana, District Una (H.P.) and Ms. Shivani d/o Sh. Sadh Mohammad, r/o Village Akrot, P.O. Thathal, Tehsil Amb, District Una (H.P.) at present wife of Sh. Anil Kumar s/o Sh. Rattan Chand, r/o Village Harsa Jandora, P.O. Bhaloun, Tehsil Bangana, District Una (H.P.) have filed an application alongwith affidavits in the court of undersigned under section 8(4) of Himachal Pradesh marriage rules (H.P.) that they have solemnized their marriage on 28-06-2024 according to Hindu rites and customs at Shri Guru Ravidass Temple Amb, Tehsil Amb, District Una (H.P.) and they are living together as husband and wife since then. Hence, their marriage may be registered under section 8(4) of Himachal Pradesh marriage rules (H.P.). Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objection regarding this marriage, can file the objection personally or in writing before this court on or before 18-06-2026 after that no objection will be entertained and marriage will be registered.

Issued today on 13th May, 2026 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal. Sd/-

Marriage Officer-cum-*Sub-Divisional Magistrate,*
Bangana, District Una, Himachal Pradesh.

In the Court of Marriage Officer-cum**-Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Bangana, District Una, Himachal Pradesh**

In the matter of :

1. Sh. Raja Ram age 37 years s/o Sh. Parkash Chand, r/o Village Dhatol, P.O. Malangar, Tehsil Bangana, District Una (H.P.).

2. Sunita Devi age 30 years d/o Sh. Bahadur Singh, r/o Village Harlog, P.O. & Tehsil Kamrau, District Sirmaur (H.P.) . . *Applicants.*

Versus

General Public

Subject.—Application for the registration of Marriage under section 15 of the Special Marriage Act, 1954 (H.P.).

Sh. Raja Ram s/o Sh. Parkash Chand, r/o Village Dhatol, P.O. Malangar, Tehsil Bangana, District Una (H.P.) and Sunita Devi d/o Sh. Bahadur Singh, r/o Village Harlog, P.O. & Tehsil Kamrau, District Sirmaur (H.P.) at present wife of Sh. Raja Ram s/o Sh. Parkash Chand, r/o Village Dhatol, P.O. Malangar, Tehsil Bangana, District Una (H.P.) have filed an application alongwith affidavits in the court of undersigned under section 15 of the Special Marriage Act, 1954 (H.P.) that they have solemnized their marriage on 25-03-2026 at Jamasni Devi Mandir, Sarain, Tehsil Bangana, District Una (H.P.) and they are living together as husband and wife since then. Hence, their marriage may be registered under section 15 of the Special Marriage Act, 1954. Therefore, the general public is hereby informed through this notice that any person who has any objection regarding this marriage, can file the objection personally or in writing before this court on or before 03-07-2026 after that no objection will be entertained and marriage will be registered.

Issued today on 22nd May, 2026 under my hand and seal of the court.

Seal. Sd/-
Marriage Officer-cum-*Sub-Divisional Magistrate,*
Bangana, District Una, Himachal Pradesh.

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Anil Kumar s/o Sh. Brahm Dev, r/o Ward No. 05, Village Jhandi, P.O. Aghar, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) declare that I have changed my name from Anil Kumar Sharma to Anil Kumar. All concerned please note.

ANIL KUMAR
s/o Sh. Brahm Dev,
r/o Ward No. 05, Village Jhandi,
P.O. Aghar, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.).

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Pramod Thakur age 38 s/o Mr. Chhato Thakur am a permanent r/o Village Kotkawala, Post Office Zamanabad, Tehsil & District Kangra (H.P.). My daughter Prachi's Aadhar Card Number is 7833 3932 4168, but the English spelling in her Aadhar Card is PARCHI, which is incorrect. The correct English spelling of Prachi is PRACHI. Please note everyone.

PRAMOD THAKUR
s/o Mr. Chhato Thakur,
r/o Village Kotkawala,
Post Office Zamanabad,
Tehsil & District Kangra (H.P.).

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Leelavati w/o Shri Manoj Kumar, r/o Village Ambwala (63), Post Office Panjehra, Tehsil Nalagarh, District Solan (H.P.)-174 101 declare that in my Aadhar Card No. 9731 1047 5553, wrongly entered name is Leela Devi. Whereas, in all other government documents my name is entered Leelavati. My correct name is Leelavati. This should be corrected. All concerned please may note.

LEELAVATI
w/o Shri Manoj Kumar,
r/o Village Ambwala (63), Post Office Panjehra,
Tehsil Nalagarh, District Solan (H.P.)-174 101.

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Atwari w/o Sh. Rati Ram, r/o Village Dhyad, P.O. Bali Koti, Tehsil Shillai, District Sirmaur (H.P.) hereby declare that in my Aadhar Card bearing No. 2556 8567 1451, my name has been wrongly mentioned as "Avtari Devi", which is required to be corrected to "Atwari". Kindly note and take necessary action accordingly.

ATWARI
w/o Sh. Rati Ram,
r/o Village Dhyad, P.O. Bali Koti,
Tehsil Shillai, District Sirmaur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Kuldeep Kumar s/o Sh. Tulsi Ram, r/o Village Kurera, P.O. Kurera, Tehsil Khundian, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) declare that I have changed my name from Deep Chand to Kuldeep Kumar. I shall be known as Kuldeep Kumar for all purposes in future. All concerned please note.

KULDEEP KUMAR
s/o Sh. Tulsi Ram,
r/o Village Kurera, P.O. Kurera,
Tehsil Khundian, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Sheela Devi w/o Sh. Udho Ram Rattan, r/o Village Dhanot, P.O. Adhwani, Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.) declare that I have changed my name from Sila to Sheela Devi. I shall be known as Sheela Devi for all purposes in future. All concerned please note.

SHEELA DEVI
w/o Sh. Udho Ram Rattan,
r/o Village Dhanot, P.O. Adhwani,
Tehsil Jawalamukhi, Distt. Kangra (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Angel Singh d/o Sh. Rohan Jeet Singh, r/o Vill. Jalari Sonkhlian, P.O. Jalari, Tehsil Nadaun, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) declare that I have changed my name from Angel to Angel Singh. All concerned please may note.

ANGEL SINGH
d/o Sh. Rohan Jeet Singh,
r/o Vill. Jalari Sonkhlian, P.O. Jalari,
Tehsil Nadaun, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Firoz Khan s/o Sh. Nazir Mohd, r/o Village Kohta Badehar, Tehsil Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) declare that in birth Certificate of my daughter, her name & my wife's names are wrongly entered as Mannat & Rasim respectively. Whereas, correct name of my daughter is Mannat Pathania & correct name of my wife is Rashmi Pathania. All concerned please note.

FIROZ KHAN
s/o Sh. Nazir Mohd,
r/o Vill. Kohta Badehar,
Tehsil Bhoranj, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Pramod Thakur age 38 s/o Sh. Chhato Thakur, am a Permanent r/o Village Kotkawala, P.O. Zamanabad, Tehsil & Distt. Kangra, Himachal Pradesh. My daughter Pragya's Aadhar Card number is 9320 4701 2544, my daughter's name is Pragya but the Aadhar Card spells it in English as Prgya, whereas, the correct spelling is Pragya. Please note everyone.

PRAMOD THAKUR
s/o Sh. Chhato Thakur,
r/o Village Kotkawala, P.O. Zamanabad,
Tehsil & Distt. Kangra, Himachal Pradesh.

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Vanku s/o Late Sh. Jami, r/o Village Gaichwari, P.O. Rohal, Tehsil Chirgaon, Distt. Shimla (H.P.)-171 208 declare that I have changed my name from Banku (old name) to Vanku (new name). All concerned please may note.

VANKU
s/o Late Sh. Jami,
r/o Village Gaichwari, P.O. Rohal,
Tehsil Chirgaon, Distt. Shimla (H.P.)-171 208.

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Punjab Singh s/o Sh. Jai Singh, r/o Village Baffrin, P.O. Baffrin, Sub-Tehsil Lambloo, Distt. Harmirpur (H.P.) declare that in birth certificate of my daughter, her name, my name & my wife's name's are wrongly entered as Banshika Thakur, Punjab Singh Thakur & Bharti Devi Thakur respectively. Whereas, correct name of my daughter is Vanshika Thakur, my correct name is Punjab Singh & my wife's correct name is Bharti Devi. All concerned please note.

PUNJAB SINGH
s/o Sh. Jai Singh,
r/o Village Baffrin, P.O. Baffrin,
Sub-Tehsil Lambloo, Distt. Harmirpur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Merry Grace w/o Sh. Sunil Sharma, r/o Ward No. 7, M.C. Rohru, P.O. & Tehsil Rohru, Distt. Shimla (H.P.)-171 207 declare that I have changed my name from Merry Grace Hurumsuku (Old Name) to Merry Grace (New Name). All concerned please may note.

MERRY GRACE
w/o Sh. Sunil Sharma,
r/o Ward No. 7, M.C. Rohru, P.O. & Tehsil Rohru,
Distt. Shimla (H.P.)-171 207.

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Santosh Kumar s/o Sh. Ramesh Kumar, r/o Vill. & P.O. Ree, Tehsil Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.) declare that in birth certificate of my daughter Nakshita Rana, my name and my wife’s names are wrongly entered as Santosh Kumar Rana & Rinku Rana respectively. Whereas, my correct name is Santosh Kumar & my wife’s correct name is Rinku Kumari. All concerned please note.

SANTOSH KUMAR
s/o Sh. Ramesh Kumar,
r/o Vill. & P.O. Ree,
Tehsil Sujanpur, Distt. Hamirpur (H.P.).

CHANGE OF NAME

I, Jogesh Kumar s/o Sh. Karam Chand aged about 35 years, r/o Village Mandyot, P.O. Lahra, Tehsil Salooni, Distt. Chamba (H.P.)-176 321 declare that I have changed my minor daughter's name from Babby one of Dipa (Old Name) to Shanvi Sharma (New Name). All concerned please may note.

JOGESH KUMAR
s/o Sh. Karam Chand,
r/o Village Mandyot, P.O. Lahra,
Tehsil Salooni, Distt. Chamba (H.P.)-176 321.

CORRECTION OF NAME

I, Sanjay Kumar s/o Sh. Saran Dass, r/o Vill. Dalicha, P.O. Tandi, Tehsil Banjar, Distt. Kullu (H.P.) declare that my son's name is wrongly entered in his Aadhar Card Koshal Thakur, the actual name of my son is Kushal Thakur. Now, I intend to correct my son's name as Kushal Thakur in Aadhar Card. Concerned note it.

SANJAY KUMAR
s/o Sh. Saran Dass,
r/o Vill. Dalicha, P.O. Tandi,
Tehsil Banjar, Distt. Kullu (H.P.).

नियन्त्रक, मुद्रण तथा लेखन सामग्री, हिमाचल प्रदेश, शिमला–5 द्वारा मुद्रित तथा प्रकाशित
इलेक्ट्रॉनिक हस्ताक्षरित राजपत्र, वैबसाइट https://rajpatra.hp.gov.in पर उपलब्ध है एवम् ऑनलाइन सत्यापित किया जा सकता है।